

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the VERY REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., THE DEANERY, EXETER, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXII

JUNE, 1936

No. 192

EDITORIAL

"I BELIEVE in the Holy Ghost." What does such faith amount to? Does it rest on a metaphor, which is a figure of speech, an interesting substitution of one thing for another, an implicit simile? Is it a convenient label denoting willingness to be led in any good direction? Is it "faith as vague, as all unsweet" as the legendary answer of the candidate who, being required to rehearse the articles of the Nicene Creed, began with the comprehensive affirmation—"I believe in all things visible and invisible"? We all know that it is something much more ascertainable than that. Yet exact definition is not easy. The belief was in fact the last major article of the Creed to be defined at all. The Nicene Fathers were content to end their symbol with "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The whole of what is meant by Lordship, Creatorship, that inner status within the Godhead which is hinted at in the doctrine of Procession, together with the Divine attributes of adorableness and of mastery of truth in revelation—all this was only to be defined later.

And yet it is God the Holy Ghost with Whom the Christian disciple first has relations. "The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." The whole atmosphere of the scene in Acts viii. is intensely "spiritual." We are clearly intended to conclude that the Ethiopian also is moved by the Spirit. It may indeed be that Philip is what we commonly call psychic as well as what we commonly call spiritual. There were in the first generation not a few like that, and Harnack has somewhere a coldly disparaging estimate of them. But if Philip was psychic, that was only his rather spectacular but not invalid way of approach to spiritual reality. On the other hand, the Ethiopian for his part has been prepared for his initiation in a thoroughly sound and orderly way. The way had been the

Old Testament, a realization of its not easily intelligible but numinous quality, a groping after Christ the Redeemer, a need felt of instruction and of membership of a society. If Philip was "enthusiastic" enough to run to the chariot, the Ethiopian at least was driving slowly enough to be able to read his book as he rode. In any case the Spirit dominates the scene. "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." This is the consistent language of the New Testament. It is by the Spirit of Christ that men are led to Christ." Even in 1 Corinthians, where excitement is deprecated and manifestations of a psychic kind are calmly reduced to their proper level of importance, it is proclaimed that "no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." Thus we have this paradox—that which is first in experience is last to be defined.

How shall we establish our hold on the doctrine, how use the Feast of Pentecost? There seem to be two things that are required. One is to have faith in the personal power of the Spirit. This may seem difficult so long as we are moving in the region of theoretical Trinitarian theology. Fashions of speech by which we seek to elucidate for ourselves the Godhead as including Subject, Object and Consciousness, or *Amans et Amatus et Amor*, contain peril of resolving the Third Person into a Relationship. We are on surer ground, as always, with historical revelation as our guide. Think of the Paraclete as the Spirit of Christ, the *Alter Ego* whereby the Ascended Christ communicates His Life, His Presence, His perpetual Grace. The Ascended Christ is the Pentecostal Christ. The days of bodily companionship are ended. There is now a larger, diffused, universally available Presence, not limited to Jerusalem or other spots on the surface of the earth, but with the *entrée* everywhere. Yet what we have, in conversion, in Baptism, in the Eucharist, is the Life and Power of Christ. St. Paul, in praying that the Ephesians might be so strengthened with power by the Spirit in the inner man that Christ might dwell in their hearts by faith, was only desiring in general what the Epiklesis bids us in one particular instance to believe. It is the Spirit Who ushers in the Christ.

It can perhaps be pictured in this way. Mankind is at first lighted by the lamp of duty. It hangs high in the heavens, full in the sight of the pilgrims as they pursue their way through the centuries. It might be thought that it would be enough to have so clear a light. Where, then, is error? It is excluded. Yet it is notorious that the pilgrims time and time again did

miss the way. They were unwilling to keep on steadfastly looking upward. Their eyes were weak, or they found other, easier directions in which to look, or the foot somehow failed to execute the bidding of the eye. The light in the heaven was not enough. And then it appeared that the mercy of God held a Second revelation. There came to be with them, walking at their side, the Companion, the Friend, the Brother. He said, "This is the way; walk ye in it." And inasmuch as He spoke in human tones, it might have been supposed that this would have met their need. And when the Friend proves Himself willing to go all the way with them, even the darkest and most terrible part of the journey, carrying on His own shoulder the burden of their weakness, their ingratitude, their viciousness, their own hostility—that surely is enough.

But not even this elicits the response. The will of the pilgrim is paralyzed. He cannot stretch out his hand to take the Hand of the Saviour. Just where he most needs help, just in the vital region of his own infirmity of purpose, he fails. It is a desperate case. But, mercifully, there is a final revelation still to come, an Endowment of Power, entering into the man, to

Bend the stubborn heart and will,
Melt the frozen, warm the chill,
Guide the steps that go astray.

This Power works from within. What, said a catechist once, is the work of God the Holy Ghost? "He makes you want to be good," a child replied. This wanting, which is a sort of release-signal for the arrival of divine grace, is not always very conscious. And that constitutes a problem, the problem of the "sad, good Christian after all," to borrow words once used by Andrew Lang in memory of an agnostic friend. It is a problem, but there is encouragement in the First Epistle of St. John. Many have wondered why the large charity of the writer is coupled with so stern an insistence on orthodoxy. God is love, and yet it seems that Cerinthus is beyond the pale. What is the synthesis? It is surely this, that it is the "spirits" which are judged. "Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God; and this is the spirit of antichrist" (iv. 2, 3). The spirits, it may be supposed, are not hindered, as men may be, by "invincible ignorance." A man may fail, for more than one reason, to formulate aright the acknowledgment of God in Christ. A spirit which resists the Christ-Spirit, or confesses not

Jesus, is definitely hostile. It is a warning against too severe judgment of the unorthodox, and even more against paltering with standards.

This, then, is the first duty, to see in the Paraclete the Christ-Spirit, Who takes of that which is Christ's and declares it unto us. Its range is universal, including whatsoever things are good and right, but they are all Christ-things. The second duty is to learn afresh how the Spirit works inevitably in and through the fellowship. Spirit must build itself a body. Even the alternatives sometimes suggested for the Church—the group, public opinion, or the totalitarian state—ineffective as they may be, are all social. There are no virtues, not even chastity or humility, still less truthfulness, generosity or charity, which can be practised alone and apart. If physical life is response to environment, spiritual life is churchmanship of some kind. The task before us is to shew that Churchmanship of our kind does succeed in applying the things of Christ to the needs of the world. Applying does not contain the promise of a cure, and it is likely enough that the suggestion of the Christian remedy will be greeted with contempt. The terms of contempt most commonly used nowadays are sentimental, unpractical, visionary. It is very likely that we shall be laughed out of court, but we must not allow ourselves to be laughed out of the neighbourhood. The world may deprive us of whatever worldly privilege remains to us, but it cannot deprive us of our conviction that the Body of Christ contains the spiritual vitality which is needed by the world at this and at every other time. It cannot cancel our obligation to testify to this, to elicit from the spiritual treasure which is available to us the resources required, and to pour them into the life of the world. This will mean obloquy and suffering, with no promise of success. But it is more blessed to be crucified than to crucify.

We have been accused by a correspondent of discourtesy in allowing one of our contributors to refer to Mr. Bertrand Russell by a title which he repudiates. It was no doubt an inadvertence. Not everyone knows that one member of the peerage has asked to be spoken of as a commoner, and, indeed, we should have supposed that the complete proletarian would find titles negligible rather than hateful. But it need hardly be said that our contributor has no wish to be or seem ill-mannered.

The article in this number on the Church and Divorce does not exactly represent what has hitherto been the general position of THEOLOGY in the matter discussed. There is, of

course, no reason why a signed article should do so. On the other hand, it contains an acute defence of the Report of a Joint Committee of Convocation, and both as an exposition of that document and as a piece of reasoning it is well worthy of publication. A recent article on the Logic of Birth Control attributed to the Lambeth Bishops a greater degree of willingness to temporize than seems actually to have been in their minds. Mr. Mortimer takes a more favourable view of the conclusions, not this time of the Bishops, but of a lesser authority. He finds motives in the Joint Committee—*e.g.*, pastoral care, desire to avoid schism and a wish to distinguish between condemnation and excommunication—which, if they were present, make the verdict at least worthy of renewed consideration. It is always in the region of the application of principles to cases that the path of true charity is difficult to hit. Accordingly, there is room for the kind of enquiry which Mr. Mortimer initiates. If we assume that the Law is the Law and that the Gospel is the Gospel, what difference, if any, is made by the fact that the Law in question is a Gospel Law? This, in spite of the interesting historical evidence contained in the article, seems to us to be the decisive point.

THE CHURCH AND DIVORCE

THERE has recently been published,* on behalf of the Council of the Church Union, a severely critical commentary on the Report of the Joint Committee of Convocations on Marriage. The authors of this commentary accuse the Report of being self-contradictory and the Committee of being mentally confused. They complain that while the Report states the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage, certain of its resolutions can only presuppose that marriage is dissoluble. "Its fundamental contradiction," they say, "is obvious to the eye, and needs no special erudition or acumen for its discernment; the man in the street may well enquire: . . . if marriage is indissoluble, and post-divorce re-marriage accordingly a breach of Christian morality, how can the Bishop be empowered to sanction—even occasionally—such re-marriage? On the other hand, if marriage is dissoluble, and post-divorce re-marriage, accordingly, a perfectly permissible proceeding, why should the 'consolation and renewed hope' which it may bring be normally forbidden to Church people in distress, and only allowed in exceptional circumstances at the arbitrary will of the individual Bishop?" (p. 40).

The authors of the commentary are able to state the dilemma thus baldly because they refuse to recognize as worthy of serious consideration the defence put up by the Committee—namely, that although an action may be wrong, it lies within the power of the Church not to enforce her discipline against the offender. This "not enforcing her discipline" the authors of the commentary call "sanctioning the marriage." But the Committee, I imagine, would call it no such thing. They would not regard such a union as marriage, and if pressed would probably describe it as a bigamous union; and they would claim that they were not sanctioning it, but permitting or tolerating it, and that there is a difference between the two. At any rate that the dilemma is not so sharp a dilemma, but that the first horn of it may be grasped and a case argued.

But before they dealt with the actual resolutions of the Committee, the authors of the commentary attempted to shake their readers' faith, if not in the *bona fides* of the Committee, at least in their intellectual ability. They accused them of a looseness which betrays mental confusion in their use of the word indissoluble. And they argued their case with great

* *The Church, Marriage, and Divorce*, Church Literature Association.

dialectic skill. Indissoluble, they maintain, means "incapable of being dissolved" (p. 14, note). It is exactly analogous to words of similar formation such as "indestructible," "infallible," "indelible," and the like. The indissolubility of marriage, according to the Western doctrine, means that a marriage once duly contracted and consummated *cannot* be dissolved. It purports to be a plain statement of a matter of fact. Consequently it is not strictly accurate to speak of divorce as "wrong": the correct way of putting it is to say that it is impossible. In contrast with this, as they allege, true use of the word "indissoluble," they set an "improper and solecistic use." This incorrect use consists in making it mean precisely what it does not mean—namely, "that *ought not* to be dissolved" (p. 13). And they point out that to affirm that a thing ought not to be done is implicitly to affirm that it can be done. Those who speak of the indissolubility of marriage in this sense, therefore, are in complete contradiction to the proper Western doctrine: this is only concealed by the ambiguity in the word indissoluble, and would be at once made clear if those who use the word in the improper sense would speak instead of "indissolvendity." The inference to be drawn from the rest of the commentary is that the Committee, in spite of a clear affirmation at the beginning of the Report that marriage cannot be dissolved, are in fact elsewhere speaking of indissolubility as though it were indissolvendity.

This distinction between a proper and an improper use of the word "indissoluble" seems at first very plausible. But a little consideration raises doubts. There are several words of this formation which do not have the meaning "can," "cannot," but, on the contrary, "ought," "ought not." Surely the authors of the commentary have not forgotten that upon which, when they were doing "greats," they cut their philosophic teeth—the confusion in Mill about the word "desirable." This word means not "can be desired," but "ought to be desired," as the they themselves recognize in using the phrase "undesirability of divorce," where surely they ought to have said "undesiderandity of divorce" if they were to be consistent. And then, again, what of "culpable," "inculpable," "laudable," "enviable," "unenviable," and perhaps, "the dishonourable honourable son of a Peer"? On purely philological grounds, therefore, there seems to be no reason why indissoluble should not mean "ought not to be dissolved."

And then, again, it does not seem that the authors of the commentary are quite clear in their own minds about this distinction between can and ought. Thus on p. 11 they say: "It follows from the western doctrine that it is not strictly

accurate to speak of divorce *a vinculo* as wrong; the correct way of stating the inference is that it is impossible." But surely, if it is impossible it is not merely "not strictly accurate" to call it wrong, it is sheer nonsense. For if it is impossible, it is nonsense to say "I ought not to do it." Again, almost the only sentence from the Report which they pick out for unqualified praise contains the same nonsensical statement—(marriage) "is a life-long vocation or relation which not only ought not to be dissolved, but also involves a moral and spiritual bond which cannot be finally terminated save by death." What does this mean? If it cannot be terminated, then there is no question of ought or ought not about it.*

All this confusion arises, I think, from a failure to perceive that in treating this subject of divorce, what we are all concerned with is not so much the question whether marriage can or cannot be dissolved, but with the behaviour of those who act as if it could. Whenever we speak of divorce, in fact, we always speak of two different things. Sometimes we are speaking of "the spiritual fact" of the life-long union of man and wife, of the permanence of the obligations of marriage, and then we say rightly "marriage cannot be dissolved." Sometimes we are speaking of the behaviour of those who act as if there were no such life-long union, as if the obligations were not permanent, and we characterize such behaviour as wrong. The ideas "can" and "cannot" in this connection are meaningless. All that we can say is that such people ought not "to dissolve" their marriage. There is, therefore, some justification in using the word "indissoluble" in connection with marriage in the sense "ought not to be dissolved," if, when so doing, we are thinking of the behaviour of those who try to dissolve their marriage. It then means "the thing called divorce *a vinculo*, which admittedly corresponds to no spiritual reality, ought never to be sought after."

And so there is, after all, meaning in the quotation from the Report, because it is speaking of two different things at the same time: and the common sense of the authors of the commentary has triumphed over their logic when they praise it. It means: "Marriage being indissoluble, not only ought not to be dissolved, but cannot be terminated." Or perhaps more accurately: "The obligations of marriage cannot be destroyed by any actions of yours, and you ought not to ignore those obligations."

* This has been expressed with his usual forceful lucidity by Dr. N. P. Williams in *The Ideas of the Fall*, p. 137: "You cannot, and therefore you ought not to commit sin, . . . which the most superficial analysis will show to be a patent self-contradiction."

It is, moreover, doubtful whether "indissoluble" could ever bear the meaning which the authors of the commentary fear it does bear for some people—namely, "ought not to be dissolved, therefore can be dissolved, and therefore in some circumstances, ought to be dissolved." This is the meaning which they say it bears in the phrase "indissoluble in ideal." But this is only possible, and is recognized to be only possible because of the addition of the words "in ideal." On the analogy of undesirable, indissoluble should mean cannot *rightly* be dissolved, or *ought never* to be dissolved; and for all practical purposes that seems to me as safe a statement as "cannot be dissolved," and perhaps a truer one. If a qualification is added like "in ideal," or "generally," or "normally," then certainly the meaning is altered: but that is not the fault of the word indissoluble.

The main criticism which the authors of the commentary make on the Report is that in spite of this emphatic assertion of the indissolubility of marriage, it nevertheless proposes, under certain conditions, to admit to Communion those who "re-marry" after divorce. The Report attempted to justify these proposals on two grounds: first, that the enforcement of discipline is a matter within the competence of a national Church, which may decide what discipline is, at any given moment, most salutary and efficacious; and second, that the Church is bound to consider the problem of whether those of her members who have disobeyed her ruling with a clear conscience must of necessity forfeit their membership. To these two pleas the authors of the commentary oppose the firm statement that "the public and explicit admission to Communion of those who practise a given mode of conduct is an implicit declaration that the mode of conduct in question is not 'sin'—that it is, at the least, morally neutral, innocent, or permissible."

This conclusion follows from their refusal to admit that the principle of "invincible ignorance" is applicable to the external forum. It is admitted that an action done in good conscience is not blameworthy—that it acquits from guilt in the sight of God. It is admitted, also, that good faith preserves the sinner from increasing his own condemnation in coming to the Lord's Table. If there was no scandal, no publicity, the authors of the commentary would see no harm or danger in allowing a person who, being in good faith, was in a state of only material sin, to remain a communicant member of the Church. The Report, therefore, is perfectly right in requiring as an indispensable preliminary to the re-admission of "re-married" divorcées to Communion, that such persons be in good faith; and in making

this requirement, the Report was no doubt thinking primarily of the sinners.

But the objection is raised that something else has to be considered besides the welfare of the sinners—the purity of the Church. It is the objection of the Novatianists against St. Cyprian, of the Donatists against St. Augustine. However conscientious the offenders may be, they have committed, and are committing, a public breach of a published law of the Church. The upholding of the moral standards and values which the Church exists to maintain requires their removal from the communicant body (p. 25). But as St. Cyprian and St. Augustine were well aware, there is something else of equal value to the moral standards or values of the Church—her unity. And where you have a large body of Church members conscientiously convinced, in opposition to the Church's ruling, that a certain course of action is right, you have a very real danger of schism. And in any case the weapon of excommunication is powerless against a large number of offenders. Its application then may reduce the Church to a sect and imperil the souls of those against whom it is directed.

Now in the past the Church has refrained from enforcing her discipline against offenders for reasons of pastoral care, without enquiring whether those offenders were or were not in good faith. The Report, in making good faith a necessary condition of admission to Communion, is being more strict. Not all offenders, but only some, are to be dispensed from the penalties to which their action has made them liable. The framers of the Report deserve, surely, some commendation from those who drew up the commentary for this enforcement of discipline.

Nor in the past when the Church acted thus mildly against certain sinners did she at all consider that she was condoning or sanctioning the sin. She did not hold it to be "morally neutral, innocent, or permissible." On the contrary, she thundered against it, just as the Report thunders against assaults on the sanctity of the marriage bond.

St. Cæsarius is a case in point. In a sermon, printed in *M.L.* 67 (col. 1085), he denounces those who keep mistresses either before or after marriage. With regard to the latter he pours scorn on those who claim that in a husband, as opposed to a wife, adultery is no sin. He straitly threatens those who behave in this way with eternal damnation, and exhorts the faithful to have nothing to do with them. With regard to the former, he admonishes and begs that those who intend to marry will keep themselves chaste until their wedding: but there are very many who keep mistresses before they marry,

and quia grandis multitudo est, *excommunicare omnes non potest episcopus*, but with groaning and many sighs he endures and waits "if happily the good and merciful God may grant them a fruitful penitence whereby they may be able to gain forgiveness." "And because this evil has become so customary that it is not considered to be sinful, lo, before God and His Saints, I protest that whoever takes a mistress, whether before or after marriage, commits adultery, and an aggravated adultery, because committed publicly, without shame, as though by right" (col. 1088). It is hard to imagine a clearer instance of fierce denunciation of wrong conduct with a refusal to excommunicate.

But in St. Augustine there is even stronger evidence of the combination of denunciation and a mild discipline. Not for one moment would he have agreed with the authors of the commentary that refusal to excommunicate meant condonation of the sin, or that to maintain the purity of the Church was always more important than the welfare of the sinner's soul. In *De Fid. et Op.* 3-4, he reminds those responsible for the administration of penance that their real business is not to destroy, but to correct and to heal. In Serm. 9 and 82, he describes the difficulty he has in convincing adulterers that they are doing anything wrong. All his efforts are devoted to convincing them of their error. He seems to have no intention of excommunicating them against their will. Drunkenness abounds in the Church and no one takes any notice of it. Augustine denounces it, deplores it, but he does not propose to excommunicate every drunkard (Serm. 17). His general principle seems to be that where a man does not think he is doing wrong, or even where he is brazen or obdurate, it is no good excommunicating him. That will only harden him still further, cause him to give up religion and finally damn his soul. Under these circumstances, however much the Bishop dislikes it, however much he deplores it and exhorts the sinner to give up his sin and do penance (Ep. 54), the only practical course is to refrain from excommunication in the hope that milder measures will induce penitence (Serm. 17). In fact, the policy practised by St. Augustine is the very reverse of that advocated by the authors of the commentary. They say: "It appears difficult if not impossible to safeguard such a procedure against the condemnation pronounced by St. Paul upon those who say, 'Let us do evil that good may come.'" To St. Augustine the evil was the excommunication, which he only imposed "*si res magis curanda non impedit*" (Ep. 153). And in Serm. 17, quoted above, speaking of drunkards he says: "Sometimes we spare: we do nothing but speak. To excommunicate, to eject

from the Church we are loath. For sometimes we are afraid *ne ipso flagello peior fiat qui cæditur*. We must pray that God will soften hardened hearts." And again in the *De Fid. et Op.* 4, after quoting the two kinds of disciplinary instructions in the New Testament, those which order excommunication of sinners and those, like the parable of the wheat and the tares, which order toleration, he concludes: "*Utrumque enim faciendum est sicut infirmitatis diversitas edocuit eorum quos utique non perdendos, sed corrigendos curandosque suscepimus, et alius sic, alius etiam sic sanandus est. Ita etiam ratio est dissimulandi et tolerandi mala in ecclesia, et est rursus ratio castigandi et corripiendi, non admittendi vel a communione removendi.*" So that the Report may claim the authority of St. Augustine at least to this extent, that in proposing to admit notorious sinners to Communion it is adopting a position which is arguable and defensible, not one which can be dismissed as unprecedented and impossible.

The authors of the commentary again say that "such a principle, if once adopted, could not be confined to the sphere of matrimonial affairs alone, but must necessarily affect the whole realm of ethics and involve the Church in a series of problems of which the full extent cannot be foreseen: the domain of commercial honesty, to quote only one example, would provide plenty of material on which casuistical ingenuity could be expended" (p. 30). St. Augustine would sadly agree, but would quote the parable of the wheat and the tares. The Church cannot be only a home for saints. Government, even in the Church, is to some extent by consent of the governed; excommunication is only practicable when it has the support of the majority.

This emerges clearly from a sentence in the *Encheiridion* (80), where he says, "Some sins have become so customary that not only do we not dare to excommunicate a layman for them, we dare not even degrade a cleric"; or more clearly still in the *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, Book III., cap. 13. He is discussing the same problem as in the *De Fid. et Op.* above: "In this difficult problem I shall propose nothing new or unprecedented, but what the health of the Church observes, that when any of the brethren are detected in any such sin as to deserve excommunication, let him be excommunicated *when there is no danger of schism*. . . . When this is clear, when there is no danger, but an absolute certainty about the stability of the wheat, that is, when each man's sin is so notorious and so universally abhorrent, that it has no defenders at all, or at least not sufficient to endanger a schism, then let the severity of discipline not sleep. . . . Then can this be done without

a blow to peace and unity and without harm to the wheat, when the multitude of the congregation of the Church is alien to the sin which is anathematized. For then the multitude rather supports the Bishop in his discipline, than the sinner in his resistance." And in cap. 14 we read: "Discipline on the part of the many cannot be fruitful except when he who is disciplined has not a crowd of supporters (*sociam multitudinem*). But when very many are stricken with the same disease, there is nothing left to the whole but groaning and grief."

It is more than doubtful, then, whether St. Augustine would be on the side of the authors of the commentary in their plea for a strict enforcement of discipline; and to their contention that the toleration of those who persist in a breach of the Christian law is impossible, and irreconcilable with a firm grasp of the truth of that law, he would return an emphatic denial. It will be noted that in the last passage quoted St. Augustine claimed that it was nothing new or unprecedented which he was proposing. Indeed, this pastoral care and zeal for the peace and unity of the Church has always been the characteristic of the discipline of the Catholic Church at her best, and has honourably distinguished her from Puritan sects from the days of Montanus downwards. The most modern example may be found in a letter to *The Times* of October 17, 1935, over the signature of Archbishop Hinsley. He is speaking of the Italo-Abyssinian War, in which the League of Nations had recently pronounced Italy to be the aggressors. He says: "Now that the League has decided, is the Pope to denounce, and launch spiritual penalties against the aggressors? . . . He has made his own moral attitude abundantly clear, and if he thought that excommunication would further the cause of justice no doubt he would speak out. But if he is practically certain that the only result would be to produce worse evils—to expose the faithful in Italy to persecution if Fascism remained in power, or to plunge Italy into chaos and anarchy if it fell—why should he, to no purpose, risk precipitating either disaster?"

And so, in this question of admitting "re-married" divorcées to Communion, I am not sure that the introduction of the principle of invincible ignorance is not something of a red herring: at any rate it is not primary. The primary consideration which should influence the Church in adopting a milder discipline is the danger of schism, resulting from the number of those likely to be affected by the enforcement of a strict discipline. In itself the proposal not to excommunicate "re-married" divorcées is at least defensible, and in no way deserves the scorn poured upon it by the authors of the commentary. It does

not betoken any mental confusion, nor any irreconcilability with a firm statement of true principles. It is not in the least true that "if an ecclesiastical authority publicly announces that those who practise a given mode of conduct can be admitted to Communion, it has thereby declared that the mode of conduct in question is considered in itself innocent and permissible" (p. 28). The question ought never to have been debated along these lines at all. The proper approach is to consider whether present circumstances do justify the fear that schism would result from a strict discipline.

It is, perhaps, here that the principle of invincible ignorance enters. The passages which I have quoted from St. Augustine and St. Cæsarius make it, I hope, clear that the sins which caused them the greatest trouble were the sins which were thought by the offenders not to be sins at all. It was the presence of this moral obtuseness which created the danger. It was only too likely, or so these Fathers thought, that persons who felt that they were being unjustly censured would in their indignation break away from the Church and form a sect of their own—they and any others who sympathized with them. It is at least arguable that we are faced with the same situation today.

The principle of invincible ignorance is of further use, as I have said, in that it affords a logical half-way house between complete toleration and strict discipline; and in that it considers the spiritual welfare of the sinners and guards against an unworthy participation in the Sacrament. At least none shall come to the Lord's Table who are unrepentant of conscious and deliberate sin.

The authors of the commentary state on p. 32 that, "in all past ages it would have been generally assumed that if ecclesiastical authority censured an ostensible marriage as 'wrong' it thereby stamped it as no marriage." And on p. 37 they refer very deprecatingly to the suggestion in the Report (p. 25) that a "re-married divorcée should not hold office of any sort in the Church." But as a matter of fact the suggestion of the Report has one very interesting parallel in the early history of the Church, which contradicts the statement just quoted above. The early Church, in accordance with the high valuation which she set upon the celibate life, had a profound dislike for second marriages. Those who married again were called bigamists. Certain sects, in particular the Novatianists, who were called Katharoi or Puritans, went so far as to excommunicate all such bigamists. The Catholic Church was more restrained. She did not like such marriages, she did not approve of such marriages, but she did not go so

far as to pronounce an excommunication on them: still less did she pronounce them void. Instead she registered her disapproval, her feeling that they were wrong, by attaching to them certain disabilities.

In the Canons of St. Basil, *ad Amphilochium*, Canon 4, second marriages incur the penalty of one year's penance. The third Canon of Neocæsarea enjoins penance on them, and the seventh forbids priests to take part in any festivities in connection with them. The first Canon of Laodicea shews a milder attitude: it does not apparently decree public penance, but only an abstention from Communion during a period of prayer and fasting, and it speaks of "*qui libere ac legitime secundis nuptiis juncti sunt.*" Clearly, then, the Church regarded such marriages as wrong, but did not annul them. But she further shewed her disapproval by making bigamy a bar to orders. This is witnessed to by Apostolic Canon 17; Basil, *ad Amphil.* 12; Origen, *Hom.* 17 in *Lucam*; Tertullian, *ad Uxor*; Pope Siricius, *ad Himerum*, repeated by Innocent, *ad Victricium*; Council of Angers (453), c. 11; Council of Tours (461), which decrees that if any of the clergy competent to marry, marries a widow, he shall be degraded to the lowest rank. This is another way in which the Church frowned on such a marriage but did not annul it.*

Finally, the position is clearly expressed by Pope Gelasius (492), *ad Ep. Lucaniæ*, in these words: "Just as second marriages are generally allowed to the laity, so, after them, no one may attain to the order of the clergy. For a licence conceded to human frailty is one thing, but a life dedicated to the service of divine things ought to be another."

Thus the position envisaged in the Report of the existence of "marriages" frowned on by the Church, and penalized by being a bar to any office in the Church, is not wholly without analogy. It is certainly true that the bigamy of the early Church is different from the bigamy of post-divorce "marriages."†

Nevertheless, if it be true that the present circumstances demand the toleration of such marriages, at least in the case

* The Council of Epaon (517) is interesting as revealing two grades of culpability in this matter of second marriages. Canon 2 re-enacts that a second marriage, or marrying a widow, is a bar to orders: but Canon 32 orders that the widow of a priest or deacon who re-marries shall be excommunicated until she breaks off the union: in other words, the marriage is null. This, perhaps, is because when her husband was raised to the diaconate they both took vows of chastity. See Agde (506), Can. 16.

† Incidentally, it is curious that the otherwise accurate authors of the commentary should insist, with some apology, in calling these unions adultery (p. 12). The proper technical term is bigamy—the parties have gone through a form of marriage, one at least being already bound by the bond of matrimony. There is everything to be said for calling a spade a spade, but it need not be called a shovel.

of those in good faith, then the Report is not being so fantastic and unprecedented in its proposals as the authors of the commentary seem to think. Indeed, I hope that I have shewn that the commentary in general has not given to the Report the serious consideration which it deserves. A specious logic has made confusion to appear where no confusion was. A passion for consistency has failed to appreciate the pastoral care which lies beneath the proposals, and insufficient consideration has been given to historical precedents. The premise from which the conclusions of the commentary followed is a false premise. I hope that these remarks may help to win for the Report further consideration on the part of any who may have been carried away by the able argumentation of the commentary.

ROBERT MORTIMER.

CRANMER ON THE LORD'S SUPPER

IN 1550 Cranmer published his "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ."

In 1551 Gardiner published "An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith, Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, with Confutation of a Book Written against the Same."

In 1551 Cranmer published "An Answer . . . unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation, devised by Stephen Gardiner . . . against the True and Godly Doctrine of the Most Holy Sacrament."

I would not, says Cranmer, "have attempted to publish this matter, if I had not before-hand excused the whole truth therein from the bottom. But because I myself am certain of the truth (which hath been hid these many years, and persecuted by the papists with fire and faggot, and shall be so yet still if you might have your own will,) and because also I am desirous that all my countrymen of England, (unto whom I have no small cure and charge to tell the truth,) should no longer be kept from the same truth; therefore have I published the truth which I know in the English tongue. . . ."

This essay is an attempt to give the argument of the Defence, together with the chief points of the other two books. Most

of the words are Cranmer's and Gardiner's own; but unfortunately there has not been room to admit in their entirety many of the grave and involved Tudor sentences in which they recorded their beliefs.

For the last four or five hundred years (so the Defence begins) the Supper of the Lord has been much abused. Some esteem it superstitiously as a sacrifice propitiatory for sin; others despise it as a thing of small or no effect. Let us, therefore, consult Holy Scripture and the ancient fathers, that by discovering what is the true catholic faith we may learn how to regard this sacrament.

"A catholic faith," comments Gardiner, "is an universal faith, agreeable and consonant to the Scripture, testified by learned men. No tokens of the catholic faith can be found in this author."

"As I have taught," replies Cranmer, "so learned I the same of Holy Scripture, so is it testified by all old writers."

Now, when a soul, inspired by God, desires to be delivered from sin and to obtain mercy, this desire is called in Scripture the hunger and thirst of the soul. And as that which comforts the body is called meat and drink, so Scripture calls that which comforts the soul by the same name. And the meat, drink, food and refreshing of the soul is our Saviour Christ. As he said himself, "If any man be dry, let him come to me and drink." And, "I am the bread of life." For as there is a carnal generation and a carnal feeding, so is there also a spiritual generation and a spiritual feeding. Our spiritual generation and feeding are, however, so hidden that only by faith can we attain to the true knowledge of them. Therefore Christ has not only set forth these things in his word, but, knowing us for babes in faith, has ordained sensible signs and tokens to allure us to more constant faith. As surely as we are washed with the water, so surely ought we to believe that Christ is verily present with us and that by him we are spiritually born and washed from our sins. As surely, also, as we see the bread and wine, smell them, touch them, taste them, so surely ought we to believe that Christ is a spiritual life and sustenance of our souls.

"Then are the bread and wine but bare tokens," says Gardiner.

"No," replies Cranmer, "holy tokens. For although it is not possible for spiritless creatures, such as bread, wine and water, to receive holiness; yet they must be called holy tokens because of the holy use to which they serve."

"The sixth of John speaks not of any promise made to the eating of a token of Christ's flesh," says Gardiner.

"In the sixth of John," replies Cranmer, "Christ spoke neither of corporal or sacramental eating of his flesh, but of spiritual eating."

"Christ said, 'I will give,' not 'I do give'; and that promise was fulfilled in his supper," says Gardiner.

"This promise was fulfilled on the Cross," replies Cranmer.

What thing, then, can be more comfortable to us than to eat this meat and drink this drink, whereby Christ certifies us that we are spiritually and truly fed and nourished by him, and that we dwell in him and he in us? Only he who condemns eternal life can lightly esteem this sacrament which is the pledge of his salvation. This doctrine may suffice for the humble and godly; and such persons may here end this book. That which follows is written to confute the vain vanities of the papists.

There are four points in which the papists vary from the truth of God's word. First they say that in the Supper of the Lord no substance remains after the words of consecration but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood. Second, that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ is really, substantially, corporally and naturally in or under the accidents of the sacramental bread and wine. Third, that ungodly men receive in this sacrament the very body and blood of Christ. Fourth, that the priests offer Christ every day for remission of sin, and distribute by their masses the merits of Christ's passion.

Now that bread is eaten in this sacrament is manifest by the words of Christ himself. For the evangelist says, "Christ took bread and brake it, and gave it to his disciples and said, Take eat." All this was before the words "This is my body," which the papists call the words of consecration. It must, therefore, be understood that Christ took bread, broke bread, gave bread to his disciples, commanding them to take bread and eat bread. It is yet more clear that the wine remains. Before the words of consecration Christ took the cup of wine, gave it to his disciples and said, "Drink ye all of this." After the words of consecration follows, "They drank all of it." What did Christ command his disciples to drink? What, then, did the disciples drink? Either the papists must say wine, or else they must accuse Christ of acting as a juggler, who conveyed away that which he had bidden his disciples drink. Moreover, when the communion was ended Christ said, "I will drink no more henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day that I shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

"In speech," Gardiner explains, "every 'yea' contains a 'nay' in it naturally. If a lapidary says, 'This is a diamond,' he says 'It is no glass; it is no crystal.' So Christ saying 'This is my body,' said, 'It is no bread.'"

"St. John," retorts Cranmer, "is not the son of the Virgin Mary. Christ said to her, 'This is thy son.' Ergo he said, 'This is not John.'"

Transubstantiation is also against natural reason and natural operation, which, although they prevail not against God's word, are yet of great moment to confirm any truth. For wine, though it be consecrated, will turn to vinegar; bread will mould; the sacramental bread and wine will nourish (and it is substance, not accidents, that nourish); above all, it is against the nature of accidents to be in nothing, for the definition of accidents is to be in some substance.

"If this author," says Gardiner, "means to confirm God's word by reason, his doctrine is more strange to me than transubstantiation is to him. If he argue from effect to cause I will disprove the conclusion by the authority of faith. However reason and philosophy are offended matters not if God's teaching is embraced."

"You cry 'faith, faith,' but your faith is disproved by God's word, and by the universal consent of Christendom for a thousand years," replies Cranmer.

"Yet," continues Gardiner, "the learned lawyer Ulpian says that wine and vinegar have one substance, which means that the accidents sour and moulder."

"Hot cannot be cold, nor cold hot, but water can be now hot, now cold; because in changing from quality to quality a substance is required to receive the qualities," replies Cranmer. "Yet I will not discuss the mind of Ulpian because I am no lawyer."

Transubstantiation is also against our five wits; and though our faith teaches us to believe things we see not, yet it does not bid us not to believe that which we daily see and touch. As far as they go, our wits confirm our faith.

"Our five wits have no skill in substances," says Gardiner.

"Although," replies Cranmer, "substances are known to our wits only by their accidents, yet they are indeed known by their accidents. And did not Christ himself prove the truth of his flesh and bones by sight, saying, 'A spirit has no flesh and bones as you see that I have.'"

Transubstantiation is also against the doctrine of the old authors of Christ's Church. (But it is not possible in a short essay to give even a summary of Cranmer's quotations. From Justin Martyr to Theodoret, the fathers are at his beck and call; and the gist of them all is that bread remains after consecration. Gardiner in his answers criticizes Cranmer's translations, and disagrees with the meaning he gives to such words as "nature, matter, form." Many of the old authors say that as the person of Christ consists of two natures, of his manhood and of his Godhead, so the Supper of the Lord consists of two parts, of bread and wine and of the body and blood of Christ.) Therefore, Cranmer concludes, either the papists must grant that the substance of bread and wine remain, or they must

confess themselves to agree with those heretics who deny Christ's human nature.

"This author," says Gardiner, "travailing to confound transubstantiation declares the real presence. For if the body and blood of Christ are but figuratively in the sacrament, then is the Godhead but figuratively in Christ."

"No," replies Cranmer, "the body and blood of Christ are not in the sacrament, but in the administration of the sacrament, present to the spirit and faith of the true believing man."

(Finally Cranmer quotes the passages which the papists are accustomed to use in support of their view; and by giving the context shews that they have not the meaning attributed to them.) "This, then," he says, "is the true doctrine of the first catholic Christian faith, that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although he be sitting in heaven in equality with his Father, is our life, strength, food and sustenance, who by his death delivered us from death, and daily nourisheth and increaseth us to eternal life. And in token hereof he hath prepared bread to be eaten and wine to be drunken of us in his holy supper, to put us in remembrance of his said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby; which benefits through faith and the Holy Ghost are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said holy supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same."

Order requires us next to treat of the manner of the presence of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ in the sacrament. All Christian people know that our Saviour Christ, being perfect God, became also for our sakes perfect man, adjoining to his divinity a most perfect soul and body; that after his death he rose again, and with the self-same body forsook the world and ascended into heaven. That Christ, as concerning his body and his human nature, is in heaven was ever the old faith of the Catholic Church. It is stated in the Creed. Christ himself said, "I leave the world, and go to my Father." St. Paul speaks of heaven "where Christ sitteth at the right hand of the Father." Many of the old fathers also discuss this matter. (Quotations follow from Origen, Augustine, Cyril, Ambrose, Gregory, Jerome, Basil, Fulgentius and Virgilius.) Our Lord, they say, is above, and yet he is here. As concerning his manhood he is in heaven; but as concerning his divinity he is with us. As concerning his divinity he is infinite; but his body must be within the compass of a place. But within the last four or five hundred years the bishop of Rome has set up a new faith, that the same body really, corporally, naturally

and sensibly is in this world still, enclosed in every *pix* and consecrated bread.

"Marry," says Gardiner, "this implies that Christ must leave his seat in heaven to be present in the sacrament, which is most untrue. Christ is in heaven; and yet his body and blood is present in the sacrament, truly is, verily is, and so indeed, that is to say, really is, and unfeignedly is, and therefore in substance is, and as we term it substantially is present. Which articles are impossible to reason, but possible to God omnipotent."

"That is to say," replies Cranmer, "that one nature in Christ is both in heaven and earth, both present and absent. As for the omnipotency of God, it is no place here to dispute what God can do, but what he does."

As for scripture to support this new faith, the papists cling to one saying of our Lord, which they misunderstand. Forasmuch, they argue, as Christ said, "This is my body," therefore that thing which the priest holds in his hands is Christ's body. Consequently it cannot be bread. Now when Christ gave bread to his disciples, and said "This is my body," it is evident—and the old authors affirm—that he called bread his body. So if this speech is plainly understood it must mean that bread is Christ's body, and that Christ's body is bread. But Christ's body has a soul, sense, life, and reason; and bread has neither soul, sense, life, nor reason. Therefore, this is not true.

"Christ's calling," says Gardiner, "is a making. That which was bread is now his body."

"Then," replies Cranmer, "it must follow that Christ had two bodies, the one made of the flesh of the Virgin Mary, the other of bread."

"In this mystery," Gardiner explains, "it is not a new body made of a new matter; but a new presence of the precious body that is never old, made present there where the substance of bread and wine was before."

"Yet if Christ's calling is a making, his body is made of bread, which is an intolerable doctrine," replies Cranmer.

Consequently this is a figurative manner of speaking. And, indeed, it is the nature of all sacraments to be figures. The ark, for instance, which was a figure of God, used to be spoken of as though it were God. When Christ said that "he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire," and that we must be born again, his words can only be understood spiritually and figuratively. And in the same way the mystery of our redemption and the passion of our Saviour Christ was expressed in the Old Testament by the paschal lamb, and in the New by sanctified bread and wine.

"The sacraments of the Old Testament," says Gardiner, "contained the promise of that which in our sacrament is given."

"As the patriarchs and prophets did eat and drink Christ, so did the apostles at the last supper, and so do we," replies Cranmer. "As St. Paul says, 'All they did eat the same spiritual meat that we do . . . ; that is to say Christ.'"

Christ himself declared that his words must be translated from a corporal to a spiritual signification when he said, "It is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh availeth nothing." Origen, writing of St. John vi., says, "Consider these things as figures, and therefore understand them as spiritual not as carnal men." Augustine says that we call the sacraments by the names of the things which they signify. Tertullian says of the words "This is my body," "that is to say a figure of my body."

"That 'that is to say' in Tertullian should be only referred to the explication of the first 'this'; as when Tertullian had alleged Christ's words, saying, 'This is my body' and putteth to of his own, 'that is to say the figure of my body,' these words 'that is to say' should serve to declare the demonstration 'this' in this wise, 'that is to say, this,' which the prophet called the figure of the body, is now my body," Gardiner explains.

"The property of the cuttle," says Pliny, 'is to cast out a black ink wheresoever she spies herself in danger of being taken, that the water being darkened she may hide herself, and so escape.' You are much used to follow the nature of this fish," comments Cranmer.

(So for thirty pages the authorities come forward one by one to declare as their verdict that the bread and wine is a figure of Christ's body and blood; that bread and wine are received in the sacrament, though they are called Christ's body and blood; that the reason why the names are changed is to make us lift up our hearts from the things we see to the things which we believe and are above in heaven.) When, therefore, the old authors speak of Christ as here in earth, they must be understood to speak either of his divine nature or else figuratively. They no more meant that he is corporally in the bread and wine than that he is corporally in his word or in the water of baptism.

"Baptism," says Gardiner, "cannot be compared with the sacrament. In baptism Christ's manhood is not really present; but by his spirit our souls are made spiritual. In the sacrament we are made participant of his Godhead by his humanity given unto us for food, and receive a pledge of the regeneration of our flesh."

"In your differences," replies Cranmer, "you speak blasphemy against the unity of Christ's person."

(Finally Cranmer explains the passages from old authors which the papists are accustomed to quote.)

"Yet," says Gardiner, "no known authors teach as this author does that the bread only signifies Christ's body absent."

"It is my constant faith," replies Cranmer, "that we receive Christ in the sacrament verily and truly. But your understanding of verily is so gross that you think a man cannot receive the body of Christ verily unless he take him corporally in his corporal mouth."

"They wonder," continues Gardiner, "at the marvellous operation of God in the substance of this sacrament."

"They wonder," replies Cranmer, "at the marvellous work of God, not in the outward visible signs but in the true receivers."

Now it is time to speak of the third error, for the papists say that whoever eat and drink the sacraments eat and drink also Christ's flesh and blood, be they never so ungodly. But Christ himself taught the contrary, saying, "I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." And, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." It follows that ungodly persons do not eat his flesh and drink his blood, unless the papists will say that they have everlasting life. But every faithful Christian man feels in himself how he feeds on Christ. He earnestly considers in his mind the beneficial death of Christ, chews it by faith in the cud of the spirit, digests it with the stomach of his heart, spiritually receiving Christ into him, and giving himself again to Christ.

"These words are true of the spiritual eating of Christ, and only good men can eat Christ spiritually; but it is not thus that he is eaten in his supper," says Gardiner.

"As good men eat and drink Christ in the sacrament, so do they eat, drink and feed upon Him continually," replies Cranmer. "Yet for the greater comfort and confirmation of eternal life they come to the Lord's holy table, that by this sacramental feeding their former spiritual feeding may be increased; and thus they grow continually more strong in Christ."

"For in his supper," continues Gardiner, "Christ gives us his very flesh and blood. And as in the parable the seed was all one, though some fell on good ground and some on bad, so is the substance of the sacrament all one, though good men eat it to life and evil men to condemnation."

"It is indeed all one to good and bad, for to both it is a figure," replies Cranmer.

Old authors say clearly that to eat Christ is to believe on him, and that this no wicked man can do, although he daily receive the sacrament. (Again the authors speak for themselves.) The papists are wonderful conjurers that can make God and the devil dwell together in one man.

"Although," Gardiner explains, "an evil man receives Christ's very body and spirit, yet Christ tarries not nor dwells not in him because of his unworthiness."

"Yet if he receive Christ he has Christ in him for the time of the receipt. How can a man be evil when Christ's spirit is within him?" asks Cranmer.

It is necessary, moreover, to speak something of the manner in which they that receive this sacrament must worship Christ. For the simple people have been so deceived that they take

creatures for their Creator and their God. They cry to the priest who holds the sacrament, "Hold up, hold up, that I may see my Maker." And they worship a piece of bread, kneel to it, knock to it, creep to it, light candles to it, honour it more than God. This is idolatry. But our Saviour Christ said, "If any man tell you that Christ is here or Christ is there believe him not." Therefore let all that love and believe Christ himself lift up their hearts to heaven and worship him there.

Now there are two kinds of sacrifices. First, there is a propitiatory sacrifice, which is the ransom for our redemption. Second, there is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, in which those who are reconciled to God by Christ may shew their thankfulness by offering themselves to him. The only propitiatory sacrifice is the death of the Son of God, who, dying once, was offered for all. As St. Paul says, "Christ offered not himself many times; for then he should many times have died. But he offered himself but once." And again, "Where remission of sin is there is no more offering for sin." Therefore it follows that the offering of the priest in the mass cannot remit the sins either of themselves or of those to whom they apply it. But it is abominable blasphemy to affirm that the Church needs any sacrifice except the Cross, or that Christ's sacrifice hangs upon the sacrifice of a priest.

"The offering on the cross," says Gardiner, "was and is propitiatory, yet in a lesser degree the daily offering is propitiatory also, because the priests make daily the self-same sacrifice that Christ made."

"Then it follows," replies Cranmer, "that daily the priests slay Christ."

"The effect of which sacrifice," continues Gardiner, "is to increase life in us, as the effect of the cross is to give us life."

But let every man trust to have forgiveness only through the death of Christ; by his own faith let him apply it to himself; and let him give the honour and glory to Christ alone. And because Christ ordained His sacraments to confirm men's faith, therefore one man cannot receive for another nor the priest for the lay people. He that would come to the kingdom of Christ must come to the sacraments himself, and keep his commandments himself. It is the priest's part to administer; but it is the part of all to receive, to thank God and to offer themselves to Christ.

So when the fathers call this holy communion a sacrifice, they either mean that it is the memory of Christ's sacrifice or that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

"Yet," says Gardiner, "this sacrifice is called by the fathers 'life-giving.'"

"But now," replies Cranmer, "you said that Christ was our full saviour. Now you say that the sacrifice of the church both gives and increases life."

But, thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of holy communion now set forth in this realm is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St. Paul and the primitive church. Nothing remains, therefore, but for all faithful subjects gladly to embrace the same, and for every man to yield himself wholly to God to serve and obey him all the days of his life, and often to come to the holy supper which our Lord and Saviour has prepared. Amen.

CONSTANCE BICKERSTETH.

ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHING IN THE GOSPELS

Two recent schools of thought have strongly emphasized the *otherness* of the Gospel narrative, or actually of the history which controls the narrative: that quality outside rational process and progress, which can be termed super-rational. Though these two trends are in most particulars as in general outlook mutually opposed, they coincide involuntarily in refuting by the sheer force of evidence the humanistic concepts regarding the Gospel and its central Figure.

Schweitzer and the eschatologists do this by forcing the reader to view the whole earthly history of Jesus as eschatologically conditioned; Barth and his school, with very different intentions, by pressing relentlessly the issue of Divine intervention which breaks into history from above.

Over-emphasis along either of these lines leads to distortion—on the one hand, God's transcendence is allowed to dominate His action, but the Immanence of God is insufficiently stressed; on the other, Schweitzer's over-emphasis forces Christ into the position of a person who expected what did not occur. But his position, as well as Barth's, serves as a pointer for our thought, which has so often been apt to water down the apparently harsh and inexplicable elements in the Gospels by giving to some allegorical interpretations and attributing others to interpolators. Literally interpreted, the extreme eschatological viewpoint is sterile (though its fruits, to judge by Schweitzer himself, do not bear out its theoretical implications, which, as they stand, one would think a poor basis for continued effort and self-sacrifice), but cannot the whole eschatological drama be transferred to a wider stage?

It is imperative to any consideration of the Gospel teaching on eschatology that four points be kept in mind: (1) The eschatological issue cannot be ignored or evaded or in any sense dismissed if a balanced apprehension of the significance

of the New Testament is desired, since this issue, however superficially repellent to modern readers, is vital to the context.

(2) This relevance is not some sort of mistake due to temporal limitations, but is integral to the texture of the writers' thought and appears to go behind that thinking and be equally integral to the teaching and outlook of Jesus Christ Himself. That being so, it cannot be pushed into the background without dislocating the shape of the Gospels and reducing their content.

(3) The Gospel teaching on eschatology cannot, of course, be separated from the Gospel concepts regarding the coming kingdom, and essentially has more to do with a *new beginning* than with ends.

(4) New Testament apocalyptic differs in one important respect from its predecessors: it is controlled by the fact of the Incarnation. In that invasion of time by eternity the Last Days have been, as it were, inaugurated. In the same sense the Kingdom has already come, because Christ has come. And these two assertions are really one and the same, are interchangeable, are at least parts of the same thought. And they point to the duality which is involved in the Gospel eschatology.

Present existence and future consummation of the kingdom: this is the most important factor of all. "No doubt the kingdom of God *is come* upon you," and yet—" . . . *then* shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory"—"and the gospel must first be published among all nations" (Mark xiii. 26, 10). On the one hand, ". . . the kingdom of God *is among* you," and yet on the other, "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven . . . so *shall* also the Son of man be in His day" (Luke xvii. 21, 24) (self-revelation and triumphant vindication in the future); and "For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" (Mark iv. 28)—the kingdom coming and developing by stages, and yet "Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark ix. 1). The kingdom *is come* and yet coming, then—in the appearing and ministry of Jesus it is inaugurated; in the near future it is to "come with power"; in the future also, but at a time which not even the Son of man can specify, it is to be consummated in the reappearing of the Messiah in glory, for judgment and vindication, when the reign of God will begin.

The coming with power no doubt signifies the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, but what of the final catastrophe and renewal? Did Christ set the Parousia in a false perspective? Did He expect the end to take place almost immediately? We

are dealing here with the time-sense of Jesus. No doubt this was limited exactly as all human time-sense must be—namely, it was confined to a sense of time and could not break through into consciousness (through the ordinary medium of the intellectual apprehension, that is; spiritually, of course, man's awareness can explore what is outside time, and no doubt Christ's capacity for the apprehension of infinity was immeasurably greater even than that of the greatest prophet) of eternity. But by the same token, His prophetic intelligence could move with a new certainty along the same lines of vision as the prophets who had forerun Him. And their time-sense was not defective. It was the revelation of Eternity which caused them to take time in the stride of their knowledge of God, and so to telescope events, but this did not falsify reality—it gave a shape to the dealings of time and thus constituted a commentary on and a philosophy of history. For Christ, too, time is relative. When He speaks of wars and rumours of war, He goes on to describe a double chain of events—the history which was to follow very shortly with the fates of His followers at the time, *and* the final consummation. But He speaks of the distant event all through His warning—the basic meaning goes behind the temporary. Surely Christ would not be satisfied merely to foretell the immediate future? His prophecy is not merely for those who stand around Him. The “you” to whom He addresses His words is a body as near Him qualitatively, though more distant in time—but to Him time (not “did not matter,” for the fact of the Incarnation forces time into significance, but) telescoped itself in His vision of the approaching battle of light with darkness.

But there is nothing evolutionary about His conception. “It is not the Catholic Christian who lives in a world of dreams, but those who place their hopes upon gradual social amelioration and a supposed law of progress. ‘The kingdom of the world’ becomes ‘the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ,’ not by conversion, but by judgment” (Rev. xi. 15) (Gore's *New Commentary*, “St. Matthew”). “As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world” (Matt. xiii. 40). Judgment implies power from above, eternity entering time, breaking into and through it. The revolutionary, as opposed to the evolutionary, coming of the kingdom is the key to the eschatology of the Gospels,* is

* This statement is likely to receive immediate challenge by the query, “What about the grain of mustard-seed?” But surely that is simply another way of saying that you cannot export revolution. Men's understanding, capacity and desire must develop, and the time must be ripe; but when that time is reached, the revolution occurs. It is not less a revolution because preparation had to be made for it. The mustard-seed does not evolve from grass or weed: it is potentially what it is going to be; but it prepares in secret for the act of appearance.

implicit in the texture of their thought and expression, and controls the Christian ethic, not by invalidating it or making unnecessary man's efforts, but by ruthlessly pointing to the only correct method by which they can be directed in accordance with the will of God.

Characteristic features of the eschatology: the suddenness of the coming, and its unexpected approach—"Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh" (Matt. xxv. 44); the disturbances preceding the coming (see Mark xiii., Matt. xxiv., etc.); judgment (Matt. xiii., etc.); the inauguration of the reign of God after the wicked have been separated from the righteous. The kingdom visualized "is . . . not an invisible union of pious souls, but a visible commonwealth" (*New Commentary*). And that society exists in embryo now, during the age of perils and alarms of which the whole Christian era, so far, is but a part. The eschatological teaching of the Gospels is neither derivative from the age in which the Incarnation took place; an incursion of the human and fallible into the Divine history; nor a vague and poetic verbiage unessential to the context; nor a fantastically expressed belief in the ultimate triumph of good after a long evolutionary process. It is definite, accurate, intense and absolutely essential. It uses the terminology of its period to express ultimate truths—but the truths are practical as well as ultimate, and concern themselves with historical and material factors as well as with "spiritual" in its narrower sense. The spiritual now determines the material and uses it so that the two planes become one, through the Word made Flesh, whose manifestation in power is the central fact and focusing point in the Divine Event which not only took place 1,900 years ago, but *is taking place* within the present order, which is the "now" of Jesus Christ, and will be consummated in the only "then" which has significance for Him or for us.

That vindication has nothing essentially to do with the "hereafter" as commonly thought of, or with any supernal wish-fulfilment. We may safely say with Irenæus: "The substance and material of the universe will not vanish away, for He who created it is true and steadfast. But the *fashion* of this world passeth away—that is, in those respects in which sin has taken place. And when this "fashion" has passed away, and man is remade and has reached his climax in incorruptibility, then there shall be the new heaven and the new earth, in which new things man shall abide ever new and conversant with God."

OLGA LEVERTOFF.

COUNTRY PARISHES

I

IN the February issue of *THEOLOGY* a pathetic cry finds utterance and receives kindly editorial comment. It is the voice of the country clergy, a multitude which is largely inarticulate. Sometimes we unbosom ourselves to one of ourselves. Perhaps when a neighbour has come over to be the special preacher we say after the service: "I am sorry there was not a better turn out, but you know what things are." Speaking generally, we say little, and only smile rather bitterly when we receive requests that we should bring all sorts of needs of the Church before our Parochial Church Meeting when it is making up its budget! Probably most of the readers of *THEOLOGY* know that in a large number of small country parishes the Annual Parochial Church Meeting consists of some half-dozen people got together almost by force by the priest, who spend the time devoted to the meeting wondering how the Church Expenses are to be met for another year.

The purport of your correspondent's plaint would, I think, be endorsed by most country clergy. Some of us (while we quite understand what our good brother means) would wish to qualify the statement that "in the country people do not want the things of God today"; not because it is untrue, but because it has always been true. Also because we feel that we do not get any further by blaming the people. God made them; the world, the flesh and the devil have had their influence on them; but they are just human beings with the same hopes, longings, desires, temptations, lusts, and sins as all the other sons and daughters of Eve.

The practical question which is always knocking at our hearts is "What is to be done?" That question becomes unpractical so soon as we begin to desiderate the doing of things over which we have no controlling influence. We cannot take the people to pieces and put them together again on a different plan. We are told that the state of affairs which we are bemoaning is due to all sorts of causes. Some say the freedom of movement which is the characteristic of our age. Well, we cannot undo the invention of the internal combustion engine, the aeroplane, etc. (We may note in passing that the motor-car has proved a mixed blessing to the country priest. It costs him too much, and tempts him to be always running about instead of staying in his parish and doing his work). Others put down the trouble to the atheistic philosophies of the day. It

may be so, though there have always been atheistic philosophies or their equivalent. In any case we cannot convert Bertrand Russell, Julian Huxley and Co., nor can we, if we would, stop them publishing their convictions, or lack of such. Others blame "the Church Authorities." One does not quite know who these may be. Some are more explicit and blame the Bishops. Even if this were true it is not much use. The country parson has an influence so slight on Church policy and on Bishops as to be practically negligible.

My question must ultimately boil down to the query "What can I do?"

The hearts of the country clergy are filled with sorrow, almost with dismay, as they see the flock committed to them leave the fountain of living waters, and hew themselves cisterns, broken cisterns which can hold no water. It is no new thing of the last year or two. I see a lady got a laugh in the Church Assembly lately by saying that unless certain things happened there would be no need to worry about the stipends of clergy as clergy would not be needed. I can remember a brother priest and Rural Dean saying the same thing to me quite fifteen years ago. To the country priest it is a matter for tears rather than laughter.

I do not know how the ebb of Church life is affecting the younger men who are taking country charges today. What I have said is true of those in the sixties; and, to a large extent, those in the fifties. Why do I draw a distinction between these? Because the man of sixty odd goes back a bit further into the Victorian period when church-going was the solid basis of any respectable life. To such a man the modern decline naturally seems a worse shaking of the things which cannot, or at least ought not to, be shaken. Those in the fifties certainly went to church in families as children, but they knew that their young contemporaries were kicking against the practice and deserting the House of God as soon as parental control ceased to function, so the subsequent falling away was not, perhaps, so surprising.

The rot, if one may so designate it, set in earlier in the towns than in the country. In town work it was beginning thirty years ago. In the country it has been to some extent a post-war experience. The history does not matter much. The painful fact remains that many country churches are largely forsaken.

II

What is to be done? Done, I mean, by the individual priest in those two places where he is to a great extent master.—i.e., his own heart and his own parish.

One of the most pathetic points in the anonymous priest's letter was his reference to his training in a splendid parish, and

the way he has conscientiously carried out the rules there laid down. How dozens of country priests will recognize that as part of their experience, and with what heartache!

How many of us got from our pastoral lectures, Theological College talks, and early training the impression that if only we did this—and this—and that, success was bound to follow, we should fill our churches!

There we touch a Victorian habit of mind, which is partly responsible for our unease. Rules of success were much in evidence in the days of the Great Queen. In the novels and plays of our youth, as well as its serious books of advice, it was made perfectly plain that work, care, thrift, and frugality naturally resulted in prosperity, comfort—in a word, success. That being our mental atmosphere, we felt that the purveying of religion must also have rules by which the desired results could be obtained. Fulfil the advice of the handbook, or of the expert, and all would be well. I do not think we realized how mechanical such ideas were. They are similar to the notion some people have of prayer as a kind of automatic machine; so many prayers put into the slot and one has the right to expect so much spiritual goods at the delivery drawer.

One of the first lessons we have to learn is that spiritual success cannot be had so simply and easily as that. We are items, but only atoms in the Eternal Purpose of God. We cannot expect that it should be easy to understand and fulfil that purpose. If we are to believe the Incarnate Word one of the outstanding features of the Day of Judgment will be surprise, pleasant and the reverse.

The fact is that we country clergy have to begin all over again. I remember a brother priest, whose parish was beginning to shew signs of the ebb tide, saying to me several years ago, "What are we to do about it?" I said I expected we should have to make a fresh start, to which he objected that he was too old. A priest connected with the A.P.R. once said: "My work for the last few months has consisted largely of trying to get country priests, who have almost given up, to start again." We know the Eternal Gospel is true. We know that Christ can satisfy every need of every soul, we see plainly enough that without Him there is no life worthy the name. We do not doubt that the Holy Ghost is as powerful for the conversion of souls as He was on the Day of Pentecost. The fault or mistake or wrong method must rest with the human element in the Church, with ourselves. We have a hint of what is wrong in that last sentence. How many of us really even hope that those awkward, materialistic, apparently godless people, whom we could so easily name, can be converted?

III

We shall have to make a pretty drastic revision of our ideas. Ultimately that means that we come back to our idea of God, and so of His Purpose. We have been trying pettifogging revisions of methods for years. In view of their failure it is surprising that more priests have not sought to go deeper. There is no need to repeat your own remarks. It is nice to know that someone feels that the country priest is a man who deserves honour, and that THEOLOGY bids him go on. I suggest that Theology bids us go on, and marks out the direction. I would only like to amplify your encouragement by saying that it is a pity that the Church's rulers do not always adopt the same attitude. I am sure priests do not want merely to be patted on the back by Bishops or Archdeacons. What they all need, most of them I believe consciously, is to be treated on the spiritual level. The keen priest wants to serve God and His Church fruitfully more than he wants anything else. He will stand a lot of criticism if it is put spiritually and with a loving effort to make him a better instrument of God. A simple illustration from life may serve to shew what I mean. A certain priest, whose house was a long way from his church, decided to say the Daily Offices at home. He had in his parish a layman of the "Awkward" variety who indirectly accused him to the Bishop of idleness in that he did not "hold services" on weekdays. The Bishop suggested a compromise of so many Offices in church a week in order to take away the cause of complaint. Now I am perfectly certain that if the Bishop had sent for that priest and pointed out, not only the definite duty of the daily worship of God in church, but also the spiritual meaning and value of the practice, that priest would have obeyed gladly and not rather under protest, as being "made to give in to old X, who is only trying to be nasty."

Whether it was purposely arranged I do not know, but it was of interest that the letter and your comment should appear in the same issue as the article on "The Cure of Souls." No doubt the writer of the letter has studied it and found food for thought, penitence and new beginnings in it. Probably the list of Theological, Philosophical, Political, and Psychological studies laid upon him may appear a bit staggering. It would be so to many priests today because we lack the discipline of study, as well as the discipline of prayer and mortification. How many priests of over fifty had drilled into them prior to Ordination that the priest's life is a life of discipline, and were put through any exercises to make it so? How many of us saw, in the specimens

of the priesthood we came across, men who were obviously given up to a tremendous work, voluntarily accepting and living a life of self-denial and sacrifice? How many of us had even heard that there were such things as Moral and Ascetic Theology? There are still many who boast of such ignorance. Would it not be true to say that many of us start our ministry with no very clear idea of what we are setting out to do; still more important, with no very clear idea of what we are setting out to be?

We are conscious, of course, that when we get our own independent sphere we shall have what would in modern parlance be called a show to run; and we are anxious, very anxious, that in doing so we shall make good. We know that it is expected of us that by some magic we should get people to come to church, "to hear us preach" is usually added. Many of us spend our lives wondering how it is to be done, trying experiments which fail. So it has come to be an accepted axiom that the parson's job is to get people to patronize his place of worship, just as the entertainer's job is to get people to patronize his place of amusement. I think that must be what makes so many priests self-conscious and nervous. We were told that we had to "get hold of the people." The attempt to do so often produces a kind of spurious "pleasantness" which amuses or irritates. Some men develop an ingratiating manner; others, probably of a more masterful temperament, a bullying one. All these idiosyncrasies are signs of weakness. They all mean that for us the centre of attention is "my work," "my people," perhaps "my failure." The centre is self. Now for a Christian we should all agree that the centre of life and thought is God. In the simplest possible words what is the matter with us is godlessness. Is that a horrible accusation, to be repelled with indignation? Not a bit of it. It is a simple statement of fact. It is not nearly so much an "insult" as the direction that we should say the General Confession. We talk about God, and want others to do so. We pray to God and accept His Sacraments, and want others to do the same. But how far do we know God, and desire to lead others to a similar knowledge? It was in THEOLOGY that some years ago Father Kelly wrote some never-to-be-forgotten articles in which he said that the business of the priest (on the manward side, of course) is to lead souls to find God for themselves. Dr. Kirk, in *The Vision of God*, has put the same thing in slightly different words.

I ask my brethren of the country ministry, Is the pilgrimage of the soul to God the main thing about us that men see? Is His worship quite plainly our first concern? Do men see easily that the one thing we want, as far as they are concerned, is not

something from them, but something for them—viz., that they should find God, and so find life which is life indeed ?

The trouble is that the idea of the priest as "a man running a show" is almost universal in England. The people to whom he is sent to minister are possessed by it. That is why they look upon going to church or even sending their children to Sunday School as a favour done to the parson, for which he is in their debt. They are his patrons, or at any rate his prospective ones, so he is to blame if the church is empty, and to be grateful to them if it is full. The idea of a duty owed to God, the idea that the Church is the Body of Christ and offers His Worship in and through Him, is completely foreign to the modern Englishman. They have got to be taught it, and shewn it, and brought back to it; and all that in face of a contrary tradition which has held the field for centuries. To change sermon tasters into worshippers is no light job, and it becomes much more difficult when the people have decided that the sermon tasting is no longer a duty, or that it can be more easily and pleasantly discharged at home, in an easy chair, with pipe in mouth, listening to the wireless.

It has been said that one result of the Reformation in England was the cutting off of English Christianity from the rest of Christendom, and so making it insular, and stunting its growth and progress. The most tragic result of this break has been that British Christians were cut off from the main stream of Christian spirituality. Protestantism, the influence of which held the field in Britain for generations, in its reaction against what it thought an abuse of the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, cut out the Communion of Saints from everything but its Credo, and more or less promulgated a kind of post-mortem excommunication of them. The Saints are the standard works, the classic examples of the Holy Spirit. These masterpieces were buried away out of sight of the ordinary man so thoroughly and so long that he has little idea of the meaning of sanctity. It is as though a school of artists were to begin a revolutionary movement by making a bonfire of the works of the old masters; or a band of sculptors were to start their career by anathematizing, and when possible destroying, everything Greece produced. God knows there has been plenty of sentimental pietism in the Catholic Church, and is now; yet those who reached canonization during fifteen centuries of the Church's life set a norm. They varied tremendously in every way but one. The essential characteristic they all bore was that they were seekers after God. It was because they wanted God Himself more than any thing in Heaven or earth, that they stand where they do in the Church's

calendar. Paradoxically enough it is this which makes them "good." It is this that makes them philanthropists, etc. They are God-seekers, God-finders, God-worshippers, and so, as a kind of important spiritual by-product, God-revealers. Our socially conscious age finds itself, to its surprise, able to admire St. Francis of Assisi, but it still shudders at the Fathers of the Desert, or any enclosed Order, because it does not understand that the essential thing for the human soul, for its life and its joy and so its beauty and usefulness, is to know God by His Grace, and so to glorify Him.

So we come back to the country priest and his problem, and we find (as we really ought to have expected if we believe in God and in Christian history) that the solution, so far as there is one—that is, the practical line of action for the immediate present—is something true but not new.

We have always known intellectually that priesthood has a double aspect, Godward and manward. We have taught it in connection with the Priesthood of our Blessed Lord, and we know that it is His Priesthood which He condescends to share with us. Yet have we not let the Godward side slip into the second place? My duty towards God comes first, and it is to know and worship Him. We have become so obsessed with "results" which can be seen that we have almost forgotten that we walk by faith and not by sight. "The Catholic Faith is this, that we worship." And the priest is set first and foremost to be a worshipper of God. We all know that any knowledge of God, and any growth in such knowledge, mean discipline. It must be discipline with the right aim and intention. We must not waste our interior efforts any more than our exterior. Our discipline of prayer must not be only an intercession for the parish, which so easily becomes a begging from God for the things we think ought to happen. It must find large room for some kind of mental prayer in which God can reveal Himself to us, in which God can have His way with us. Our discipline of pastoral activities must be founded on a view of our fellow-men not as possible converts and communicants, who will swell the numbers in the Official Parochial Return, but as, each one, that deep mystery, a human soul, created by God, injured by Sin, redeemed by the terrible mystery of the Divine Passion, for whose love and fellowship the Sacred Heart of Jesus is longing.

Yes, quite simply, we have got to get back again to God Himself. Souls still want God. They do not want to be fobbed off with anything else, anything less. Many, as always, are content to wallow in bodily satisfactions; many are content with the English equivalent of Stoicism, but there are multitudes

who are not satisfied with what this world can give to body or mind or soul. They want God. We cannot pass on a knowledge of anyone whom we do not know. We do not need to be told that to gain, let alone to pass on, the knowledge of God is much the hardest task a soul can set out upon. This is bound to be the case, because we set out on an ever-lengthening road, the finite seeking the Infinite. The further we travel, and the more we discover, the more we realize that we are at the beginning—always a new beginning. It is that which drives away the mists of depression in a rightly lived spiritual life. The pilgrimage is ever fresh, and freshness cures depression quicker than anything else. No man or woman is depressed when assured by a glowing light ahead that the "best is yet to be." Bamboozled by the difficulties of finding the way, breathless and panting by reason of its hardness, sorely wounded and defeated by the Adversary the pilgrim soul may be, but it will not be depressed, and it will certainly have no place for that bugbear of modern life—boredom.

All this seems to be only repeating well-known things about the inner life of the priest; not helping him in facing the problem your correspondent stated. The two are really closely connected. Our bankruptcy is always God's opportunity. Does that mean that we are after all finding another prescription for "success"? No. The truth is just that any Godward life, which seeks to know Him and to fulfil His Will, is the biggest contribution any soul can give to the Kingdom of Heaven. It will certainly be used by the Divine Omnipotence in the mystery of His purpose. Whether we shall see the use to which it is put before the Day of Judgment is quite another story.

Some saintly lives by seeking God rather than success call forth a wonderful and visible response. That rests with God. If "nothing happens" remember that we follow One Who from the world's point of view was a complete failure; one of the last sounds He heard was the contemptuous laughter of those who had done Him to death. Remember that the Psalm which comforted Him upon the Cross begins with "My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" and ends with "My seed shall serve Him." Remember that Bishop Westcott used to quote another Psalm as setting forth the method of God's working: "Shew Thy servants Thy work: and their children Thy glory."

NORMAN K. LEACH.

MISCELLANEA

WILLIAM LAW ON ENGLAND AND ROME

(The following appeared in the April number of Œcumenica, and is reproduced here as we think it will be of interest to our readers.)

IN one of his letters (*Works*, vol. ix., pp. 222-8, edition 1762, reprint 1893) William Law gives a little apologia for his position as an Anglican, which is in its way a perfect model of what such an apologia should be.

He points out that the separation of the Anglican Church from the Roman is very deplorable, and schism is a grievous sin; but that the guilt of schism belongs to those who started it, and not to those who live as members of the Church after it has occurred. "Let us suppose that it was the lust of Henry VIII. and the temporal claims and usurpations of the Pope that occasioned the schism; that Henry, to support himself, commits sacrilege of all kinds, and stops at no injustice; that the Pope, to preserve his power, excites to rebellion, and calls subjects from their natural allegiance; supposing this injustice on both sides, does it follow that communion in either or both Churches became unlawful to these who had not only had no hand in the beginning or continuance of such injustices, but heartily grieved for them, and prayed God to put an end to them? . . . The Convocation in England and the Council of Trent proceeded in such a manner as to leave it very doubtful which of them contributed most to establish the schism. But was the Church lost when it became thus divided? Were baptism, the holy eucharist, and all the sacred offices of divine worship, no longer of any benefit to the true lovers of Jesus Christ, friends to holiness, purity, and unity? Did they lose the means of salvation, pray to and worship God in vain, receive fruitless sacraments . . . because they did not govern their governors?" Just as "the personal vices of the priest do not render the sacraments useless to those who receive them from his hands," so, in this case all sins are personal, and only so far chargeable on any person as they are his own voluntary acts."

But then, he asks, do not all those who communicate with a schismatical Church thereby become partakers of its schism? He replies: "If I communicate with a Church because it has such terms of separation from others, and am glad to see it so divided and others separate from it, then by communicating with a schismatical Church I partake of its schism. But if I communicate with it, not because it is so divided or has such terms of communion, but because it is a Church and has the means of salvation in it, because it has an authority, though an abused authority, over me, and because I cannot renounce its communion and enter into any other Church, without making myself a partaker with those who also schismatically contemn and divide from its communion . . . it seems to be against all the principles of equity, reason, and religion, to lay schism to my charge. For what is it that has made the schism, but the unreasonable quarrels and unjust claims of the governors on both sides? Can I undo what has been done, by my changing sides?"

Thus he justifies himself for remaining in the Church of England, and

equally justifies those who are Roman Catholics for remaining where they are. He goes on to say that schism is indeed an evil, and being evil produces evil effects, hatred, bitterness, controversy of the wrong kind, in which men are busy defending not the divine Gospel nor the unity of the Church, but actually maintaining and defending the schism which divides it. In consequence, those whose labours are really directed towards peace and unity are likely to get blows for their pains. What, then, can we do? "Every part is in a state of division and chargeable with contributing to the cause of it. The thing which we are to look for, therefore, is, not to be out of a divided part of the Church, which is impossible, till it pleases God to alter the state of Christendom, but that we may live in these divided schismatical and uncharitable parts of Christendom, free from schismatical principles and passions."

He proceeds to explain the presuppositions on which his argument rests: (1) That every part of Christendom, Grecian, Roman, Reformed, is in some measure guilty of schism. (2) That the means of salvation be fully preserved in the divided parts: "this, as to the Church of England, seems to be plainly granted by the Church of Rome, since history attests that the Roman Catholics, for several years after the Reformation, contented themselves with our communion"—here we must note that when William Law wrote, the bull *Apostolicæ curæ* was still far in the future. (3) That the argument does not at all involve that the great divided parts of Christendom are equally to blame for the schism;" (4) nor does it imply "that each divided communion, though containing the full means of salvation, is equally desirable, or has all the same helps to piety and holiness of life that the other has. If you ask whether the Church of Rome or England has the most helps to a solid and substantial piety, that is more than I can pretend to answer; and perhaps it is a question that cannot be absolutely or strictly determined." In other words, it is irrelevant to ask and try to decide which is the "best" Church. "And although it is an easy thing for private persons to find books that have determined this point with great positiveness, and make one communion only right and all the others wrong, yet I cannot think in this manner; I see too much to be liked and disliked in every communion, to think that any side is free from objection, or that salvation is only to be had in one communion."

At the end of the letter, he rejoices over the fact that he finds excellent books written by members of the Roman Church. "As I consider their Church, and all its members, as my brethren in Christ, and as nearly related to me as any Protestants, so it is the same satisfaction to me to receive benefit from their Church as from that of England; and I am as glad to find the increase of piety, or any extraordinary instances of it, amongst them as amongst ourselves. In my own heart I drop and forget all those distinctions and divisions which the enemy hath set up amongst us, and desire God to receive me and my devotions as united with and recommended by all His Church in heaven and on earth; and by this oblation of myself to God, I trust to be received by Him as truly of the same communion with all His Saints, as if I had been a member of every particular Church in which any of them lived . . . and being of this particular Church, not because it is externally so divided, but because there is no part free from the same external division, I consider every saint as a proof and testimony of God's blessing upon that Church of which I am a member."

This sort of thing has often been said by others; for it is very typical of the Anglican mind; but it would be hard to find a place where it is better said than in this passage of William Law. To us it seems a model of the conversations which Christians of different confessions ought to hold with one another.

X.

THE APPROACH TO THE ATONEMENT

(THE purpose of this sketch is to give in outline a course of study which may be followed by individuals or by study-groups. Reference is made to the *Way of Renewal* Syllabus, No. 7.)

I.—*The starting-point* is here and now;

The problem is a personal problem.

There are three people "at odds," "across each other."

There is a difference, a separation, a lack of unity; these people need to be "at-oned" (cf. *Othello*, iv. 1); they are God, man, and man's fellow-man.

John Brown does not pray, worship, or recognize God in any way other than as a social custom, or in superstition.

This is due partly to ignorance, denseness, lack of opportunity;

This is due partly to a sense of dislike of what he thinks is God;

This is due partly to fear;

This is due partly to a deeper disharmony caused by wrongdoing, preference for self, disobedience.

John Brown has also fallen out with his fellow-men: with his next-door neighbour, his employer, his squire, his wife; he has a grouse against society at large.

There is much consequent suffering and loss, discomfort and unhappiness.

Yet God and John Brown exist for and need each other;

John Brown and his fellow-men need each other.

Therefore there is an urgent and vital need of "at-one-ing."

Further, John Brown has disharmonies within himself; he is a mixture of conflicting tendencies; he has two or more selves.

Therefore he himself needs to be "at-one-d."

The essence of the situation is personal; it not only involves offence against law or principle, though these are present, but it centres in personal relationships.

The need is threefold (as its direction is also threefold):

i.e.: the removal of the disharmony;

the removal of the cause of the disharmony;

the prevention of its recurrence.

II.—*The first step* is to make clear what is the ideal relationship between God and John Brown; and between John Brown and his fellow-men.

Then—what has happened to interfere with this?

how did it happen?

what is the result?

what is needed to restore the ideal?

There are certain customary ways of speaking about this: *cf.* Syllabus, § 1.

How far are these true, adequate, misleading?

III.—*The next step* is to study man's own attempts to "put himself right."

E.g., ordinary men, reformers, philosophers, moralists (including the Greek dramatists), religious.

How far have these been right in theory, efficacious in practice?

IV.—*The Teaching of the Old Testament.*

Study this in four periods:

pre-prophetic—to c. 750 B.C.

pre-Exilic prophets—to 586.

post-Exilic prophets—to c. 400.

post-prophetic—after c. 400. (This last is essential as the New Testament cannot be fully understood without it; it includes the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha.)

Make clear what Judaism teaches about God, especially in His relation to human sin; and about man's mutual relations.

How far is this of permanent truth and value?

How far is this adequate, or misleading? (Syllabus, § 4).

V.—*The New Testament.*

This is the record and explanation of something which happened—*i.e.*, something which was actually done in order to restore the ideal.

The Fact and Person of Jesus Christ;

The Incarnation as the first step in the "at-one-ing" (*cf.* the obsecrations in the Litany).

What do the Gospels and Epistles teach about this?

What does our Lord teach about His own Person, especially in relation to sin and forgiveness?

What do the Epistles teach?

How far have both developed and supplemented Judaism?

Study this in the threefold aspect:

God and man;

man and man;

man's own inner harmony.

Syllabus, § 2, 6.

VI.—*Fundamental Conceptions.*

- i. Discuss the actual words used, in the Bible and in theology, and find their real intention and meaning. (This is not needlessly academic; C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, has shewn that the Greek words for "sin" are too weak to do justice to the Hebrew originals; even among ourselves people "do not talk the same language" and words bear different meanings and values; it is a very real problem in the mission field.)

Syllabus, § 3.

- ii. Outline and discuss the customary language in which the work of Christ has been described:

I.e., the "traditional theories of the atonement."

How far have these any meaning for us?

How far are they true? adequate? misleading? (Most objections to "the atonement" have arisen from misleading and erroneous explanations.)

iii. What sort of a God do they imply?

Is God alienated from us, and does He need to be won back?

Syllabus, § 8.; cf. Lambeth Report, 1930, § 1.

iv. The place and appeal of the Cross.

Syllabus, § 5.

v. God's part in the work of Jesus Christ.

Syllabus, § 6.

vi. Man's part in the work of Jesus Christ.

Syllabus, § 7.

vii. Evil—its nature and forms;

its part in causing disunion and disharmony;

how does Christ overcome and remove it?

how does Christ "save" us and restore "at-one-ment"?

VII.—*The Pastoral Problem Again.*

How can we explain in modern terms and language what Christ has done for us?

How is to be made effective the "at-one-ing" of

God and John Brown?

John Brown and his fellow men?

John Brown himself (the "integration of personality")?

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

JONES OF NAYLAND

"A NAME more venerated than even that of Sikes [of Guilsborough] is William Jones of Nayland (1726-1800), the typical High Churchman of an earlier generation, a clear-sighted and authoritative thinker, as well as a man of holy life and evangelical poverty, who may be taken as the typical High Churchman of his time." So F. Warre Cornish in his *History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century* (i. 69). "Jones of Nayland" is a name familiar from such notices in *Histories of the Church of England*; his famous book was *The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity*. I should like to call attention to his work *The Book of Nature: Or, The True Sense of Things explained and made easy to the Capacities of Children*. It was published by the S.P.C.K., on whose list it remained for many years. Few books illustrate more vividly the assumptions of the time, and therefore the gulf between theological thinking in that day and in ours.

Lesson I. begins with the Beasts. First comes the lesson, then a prayer, followed by a Catechism and Scripture texts. He begins: "The ass hath very long ears, and yet he hath no sense of music, but brayeth with a frightful noise. He is obstinate and unruly, and will go his own way, even though he is severely beaten. The child who will not be taught is but little better; he hath no delight in learning, but talketh of his own folly, and disturbeth others with his noise. The dog barketh all the

night long, and thinks it no trouble to rob honest people of their rest." And so with the fox, the wolf, the adder.

The prayer runs: "Lord . . . let me not dishonour thy work, by turning myself into the likeness of some evil beast; let me not be as the fox, who is a thief and a robber . . . but let me be harmless as the lamb, quiet and submissive as the sheep. . . ." Among the Questions we find:

"Q. What is the child who will not learn?

A. An ass, which is ignorant and unruly."

"Q. What are ill-natured people, who trouble their neighbours and rail at them?

A. They are dogs who bark at everybody."

Lesson II. is on "The Eel and the Lark." "The eel buries itself in the mud. What a poor nasty life it leads!" "Q. How do the lives of worldly men differ from the lives of Christians? A. As the life of the eel differs from the life of the lark." Again: "Q. Why did He make owls, bats, and swine? A. To teach us what we ought not to be."

An eminent theologian, judged by the standards of his time, looked out on the animal creation and saw them existing with no right of their own but merely to inculcate moral lessons to humanity. Have we the right to criticize? We assume that animals exist to be slaughtered for our food, or adornment, or pleasure. Is it so very foolish to suppose that they exist also to help our moral education? I am afraid we cannot justify Mr. Jones along these lines. His natural history is defective, to begin with. The marvellous migrations of the eel (which were then unknown) across the fields in autumn and along the ditches and rivers till it reaches the sea shew a spirit of soaring adventure far nobler than that of the lark, if moral lessons are to be drawn. Then he ignores inconvenient facts. The fox is a thief because he violates man-made laws of property and kills domestic fowls: the lark is praised, though he lives by hunting lesser creatures. No, I am afraid we must conclude that Jones of Nayland's intellectual powers were very scanty. A small child today would be amused at this dialogue, so naively does it put the cart before the horse.

"Q. What is a tabernacle?

A. A tent stretched out with cords, and moveable from one place to another.

Q. Who dwelt in these tabernacles?

A. The holy patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Q. Why did they inherit such dwellings as tabernacles?

A. *To remind them daily that they were strangers upon earth.*"

W. K. L. C.

THE ASCENSION AND THE APOCALYPTIC HOPE

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ACTS I. 6-8.

THEY therefore, when they were come together, asked Him, saying, Lord, dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within His authority. But ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you. . . .

If these words represent the substance of what Christ said at the time of the Ascension, they are literally the "last word" on the eschatological problem. In view of Schweitzer's theory that Jesus expected the second coming in His own lifetime and went to His Crucifixion in order to force God's hand, it is interesting to have our Lord's final words about the apocalyptic hope.

It appears that far from shewing any embarrassment at His failure to stage a Messianic triumph Christ once again tried to teach His disciples that His kingdom was "not of this world." It is also clear that in spite of His frequent attempts to give them a spiritual view of the kingdom they still clung to the old nationalistic form of the Messianic hope. And even after the Crucifixion and Resurrection they could ask Jesus if He was about to restore the kingdom to Israel.

Our Lord's reply is most instructive. He tells them that it is not for them to know the time of the end. This is consistent with His earlier saying: "But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father (Mark xiii. 32). And this definite admission by Jesus that even He did not know when the end was to be is in no way inconsistent with the saying, "There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28), because it is most probable that this latter text refers to the fall of Jerusalem and not to the end of all things.

Now our Lord's reply may be paraphrased thus: "You are not meant to concern yourselves with earthly kingdoms and the times of their rise and fall, but the only kingdom you should care about is a spiritual one. This is going to be established in your hearts by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and you are to promote it by preaching the gospel."

And so Christ's words are in line with the view that the giving of the Paraclete was in a true sense a coming of God's kingdom.

A consideration of the divergence between the Synoptic and Johannean teaching about Christ's impending "return" is not within the scope of this note, but the passage Acts i. 6-8 suggests that St. John faithfully reflects the gist of Christ's later teaching on the subject. On the other hand, the First Gospel has obviously exaggerated the apocalyptic element in Christ's teaching, and it is possible that sayings of St. John the Baptist have been erroneously attributed to Christ (*cf.* Matt. iii. 7 and xii. 34).

But two things prove that even the most apocalyptic of Christ's sayings should be interpreted in a spiritual sense. Firstly, Dr. Temple has shewn that the three Temptations are all connected with the Messianic hope. They arose from the expectations of the Messianic banquet, of the sign from heaven and of the earthly kingdom. Moreover, he is convinced that Christ abandoned the apocalyptic hope as completely as the other two (*Christian Faith and Life*, pp. 30, 31). There is no intention of denying that Christ accepted the rôle of Messiah at His baptism, but His ideal was that of the Suffering Servant rather than that of the Messiah as popularly conceived.

And secondly, Jesus never accepted the apocalyptic hope in its nationalistic form. If He had been willing to do so, He might never have been crucified. It was because He had a purely spiritual ideal of Messiahship that the people turned against Him.

It is evident that even the most intimate of our Lord's disciples were slow to understand the nature of His kingdom, and to many the

Ascension must have appeared as a strange reversal of the old hope. Men had expected the Son of man to descend from heaven in glory to establish an earthly kingdom. To their consternation He ascended to His heavenly kingdom.

If we can accept one of the sayings attributed to Christ by the Fourth Gospel, it shews that He foresaw this paradoxical event and its consequences.

We learn from St. John vi. that after the discourse on the Bread of Life the disciples said: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it? But Jesus knowing in Himself that His disciples murmured at this, said unto them, Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where He was before?" (John vi. 60-62).

These verses have been variously interpreted, but there can be little doubt that Christ looks forward to the Ascension (and not the Crucifixion as some have suggested). The meaning of the saying seems to be: "If you are offended by My spiritual interpretation of the Messianic banquet, what will you say when I ascend into heaven instead of establishing an earthly kingdom?"

In His discourse Christ had told the people that they ought not to seek bodily refreshment from the Messiah, but that their hearts ought to be set upon spiritual needs. He argues that if they are offended at this sacramental view of the Messianic banquet they would be still more offended when He treated the apocalyptic hope in the same way and set up a heavenly and not an earthly kingdom.

Thus interpreted, the Ascension dealt the final blow to the apocalyptic hope, which (as Acts i. 6 shews) had survived even after the Crucifixion and Resurrection. But the message of Ascensiontide is one that is especially needed today when men's hearts are once again set upon earthly kingdoms and we fear their rising or their falling. The spirit of nationalism that destroyed Jesus again threatens to overwhelm us His disciples. May the time come when all men learn to set their hearts upon the things that are above and not on the kingdoms of this world.

V. A. HOLMES-GORE.

THE PROBLEM OF THE LECTIONARY

ONE of the things that makes Lent even more penitential than it need be for the clergy, and for such of the devout laity that attend the daily Offices, is surely the first lesson. Important as it is to remember that the Christian Church is the New Israel, and that its worship developed out of the worship of the Temple and the Synagogue, is it necessary to make the clergy wade through all, or most, of the ceremonial directions in the book of Exodus? The purpose of the Office is spiritual reading, not scholarly research; but there is little basis for meditation in many of the lessons provided.

The lectionary of 1928 is a great and welcome advance on the older lectionaries, but it still leaves much to be desired. The writer feels sure that many of the clergy are dissatisfied with it, and especially with the Sunday lessons. In this article he proposes to make certain criticisms of it, and then to make some suggestions that may help to tide us over till official action is taken.

I

To deal with the Sunday lessons first. The compilers of the lectionary seem to labour under three very serious misconceptions.

Firstly, it still seems to be supposed that the majority of people come to church, and to Matins and Evensong at that, every Sunday. This is no longer the case. In many parishes the laity never come to Matins at all, and the number who attend both Matins and Evensong is small and decreasing. Yet throughout most of the year the Old Testament lessons are arranged on the assumption that the same people attend both services.

Next, they do not seem to have rid themselves of the idea that extracts from as many books as possible must be read. On the second Sunday after Trinity, Ruth i. is one of the evening lessons provided, but the rest of the book is not read on any other Sunday. The important books of Ezra and Nehemiah are represented by one alternative lesson from each book on the fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Thirdly, the revisers do not seem to realize the harm done to uneducated people by reading to them stories such as that of Noah's Ark. Our better educated congregations now know enough of Biblical criticism and the Church's attitude to it to realize that by reading such stories we do not commit ourselves or them to belief in their literal truth. But in working-class parishes there are generally few people with such a background, and fewer still who can distinguish between "truth of fact" and "truth of value." At their work they hear constant criticism of the Church, much of it directed against just such Old Testament stories as immoral and untrue. If they hear them read in church, they naturally assume that they are committed to belief in them, and they find themselves placed at a great disadvantage in argument with unbelievers. Of the first lesson provided for Good Friday morning, the writer cannot trust himself to speak or write calmly.

II

The daily lessons are far too long. The Revised Lectionary has delivered us from some of the more unprofitable Old Testament passages, but there is still much that might well be omitted from our Office books. Even the New Testament lessons—or perhaps one might say especially the New Testament lessons—are often of quite absurd length. Those of us who accept the obligation of the Office usually try and take the second lesson as the basis of our meditation, and we would be greatly helped if the lesson were shorter and more of a unity. Let the second lesson at Evensong on the Saturday after the fourth Sunday after Trinity serve as an example; it contains the stories of the commission of the Twelve, the beheading of St. John Baptist, and the feeding of the five thousand. What can we, or the faithful few who say Evensong with us on Saturday night, make of this?

And it would surely be a help to us, in meditation and study, if in the arrangement of lessons more account were taken of the findings of the scholars. On the weekdays after Epiphany we read the Twelve Prophets: not arranged in their chronological order, so that we may follow the development of prophetic religion, but in the order in which they occur in the Bible.

III

What can we do about it? It will probably be a long time before Convocation will or can devote its time again to this matter. But meanwhile we have got our congregations to consider. The daily lessons are not such an urgent problem, and for the time being the clergy must just accept them as one of their crosses. But the Sunday lessons present a problem that should be faced as soon as possible. Is it too much to ask some of the scholars who contribute to *THEOLOGY* to help us parochial clergy, who lack both the time and the scholarship necessary for such a task, with an interim revision of the lectionary?

Here at once will arise the question of "loyalty." Admittedly, it would be a departure from the letter of the law, but would it be a departure from Anglican tradition? The present writer would unhesitatingly say "No." The Church of England has always tried to induce her people to read and study their Bibles, and to read and study them intelligently. Our Church's services to Biblical scholarship have been great: can we not help our laity to appreciate them, and so to appreciate more fully the truth and value of the Bible?

May the writer make some positive suggestions as to the lines such a revision might follow? Firstly, the morning and evening courses of lessons would be independent, so that those who normally attend one of these services would be able to follow a consecutive scheme. Secondly, the lessons would be arranged in a three years' course, as the revised Scottish Lectionary arranges them. The lessons could then be shorter, and it would be insured that all of the Bible that it was desired to read would be read at some time. It is quite impossible to give our people all they need to know of Scripture in a year.

The habit has been growing up of recent years of introducing the first lesson with a few words of explanation. This is all to the good, but it only irritates people when the explanation is merely exposition. A few well chosen words, putting the lesson into its context and historical setting, are helpful and appreciated. But do let us shew our respect for our people's intelligence by refraining from explaining the obvious!

Certain very real advantages would arise from the use of such a scheme of lessons. It would help to clear up many popular misconceptions about our attitude to the Bible. We are too prone to forget that the man-in-the-street, and too often the man-in-the-pew, still thinks that we are committed to the views expressed by Gladstone in his famous correspondence with Huxley. And there are many of our people who for various good reasons cannot join Tutorial Classes or other formal educational activities, who yet desire to learn, and whose only opportunity of doing so is in church on Sunday. Also, it would free us to preach about other things. How often do we sit down on Tuesday morning, and look up the lessons for next Sunday, and say to ourselves, "Well, although there are a lot of other things I want to talk about, I simply cannot read this without explaining it to my people."

D. B. MACGREGOR.

THE PRINT OF THE NAILS

ACCORDING to the tradition which places the Resurrection appearances in or about Jerusalem, there is an indication that the risen Lord did not shew Himself in face and figure exactly as He had been known in the past. Mary Magdalene beheld *Jesus standing and knew not that it was Jesus*; Cleopas and his companion were unaware as to whom they were listening on the Emmaus road; and in the Upper Room the Apostles *supposed that they had seen a spirit*. But whatever difference the risen body shewed, there remained a clear proof of its identity, *the print of the nails*. *Behold My hands and My feet that it is I Myself*. It was that sign which appears to have convinced the Apostles and which they gave as the proof of their faith to St. Thomas, and which led him to say, *Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails . . .*

May we not therefore infer that the Lord, who was unrecognized by the two companions on the Emmaus road, gave them the same sign of His identity? On the road and before the supper Jesus' hands would not come into prominence, but when He took the loaf and broke it, the two disciples would see the uplifted hands bearing the print of the nails, and the Lord would be *known of them in the breaking of the bread*.

Moreover, if this breaking of the bread was a Eucharist, how perfectly the Passion and Resurrection of Christ were shewn forth together!

L. B. TOWNER.

NOTE ON MATT. XV. 21-28 (THE CANAANITISH WOMAN) COMPARED WITH MATT. VIII. 5-13 (THE CENTURION'S SERVANT)

THE only two cases of miracles wrought for Gentiles. Superficially different, but with resemblances which can scarcely be accidental.

(a) In both cases the request made on behalf of another, and the faith "vicarious."

(b) In both cases *humility* shewn along with faith—*οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς*—the acceptance of the position of *κυνάριον*.

(c) In both cases the request is backed up by an argument or analogy—*καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ*—(Matt. viii. 9) *καὶ [γὰρ] τὶ κυνάρια* (xv. 27).

(d) This is welcomed by our Lord as a proof of faith, and in each case He comments on the exceptional faith displayed (may we compare Rom. ix. 30-32?).

(e) Compare also *ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι* (viii. 13) *γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις* (xv. 28) (only in Matthew). We may possibly see a further resemblance. If McNeile is right in taking *Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν* as a *question*, it is parallel to the silence and refusal in Matt. xv. 21-28.

If *ἀποκριθεὶς* in xv. 24 refers, as it seems to, to an answer to the disciples, then we must be right in taking *ἀπόλυσον* in v. 23 to imply a suggestion that it would be best to grant her request; otherwise the answer must be regarded as addressed to the woman, which seems a less natural interpretation of *ἀποκριθεὶς*.

R. J. MORRICE.

REVIEWS

HEALING: PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN. By G. G. Dawson, D.D.
S.P.C.K. 9s.

In most books dealing with spiritual healing, some special aspect of the subject or its special relation to one or other branch of the healing art is generally treated and one is left with a certain sense of incompleteness. But Dr. Dawson takes a wider standpoint. It is the standpoint of the Lambeth Report of 1923, that the healing power uses three avenues of approach, the material, the mental, the devotional or sacramental, and his study, both intensive and extensive, aims at placing religious healing in its proper milieu both in regard to science and to religion. He claims that Christian healing is more than what is generally called "spiritual healing" in the narrow sense, for it is brought about in obedience to the laws of the physical, mental and spiritual realms. This gives it an ethical tone which is of paramount importance and marks the difference between pagan and Christian healing. But more than this—and here again is an echo of the Lambeth Report—Christian healing is redemptive and seeks the highest welfare of the whole man—*i.e.*, his salvation, and not merely his physical fitness. That is to say that the author insists, rightly, on the fact that healing in any of its branches is dealing with personality first, and not first with disease. And clearly the Church has a rightful place when the salvation of a personality is concerned.

Mr. Dawson lays his foundations both wide and deep. The first six chapters of his book are a survey of the whole conception of disease and the practice of healing from primitive times until the coming of our Lord. Disease and death were "unnatural" to the primitive man, but since he had no knowledge of his own personality, he had no explanation to offer and could only take refuge in magic (white, to ward off evil from himself; black, to bring evil on his enemy).

The long process towards scientific knowledge, fostered by the Greek spirit of enquiry, hindered by, *e.g.*, the mere empiricism of the Latins, is carefully told and well documented. The dominant influence of Arabia in medical research during the dark ages of Europe is given due place. And alongside of this survey of scientific progress, the growth of ethical ideas is recorded. Here the place of Hebrew thought and teaching is supreme in the ancient world, and it did not lose its importance as God's ancient Church was refounded by our Lord as the Holy Catholic Church.

Yet even in His time the ethical ideal was still beset by

magical ideas. Incantations (Mr. Dawson mentions 100 prevalent in Christ's time), talismans, etc., were still regarded as potent. All disease was believed to come either directly from Yahweh or to be allowed by Him, but healthy living was a religious as well as a social duty. Yet Christ's enemies regarded His healing miracles as evidence that He was a magician. The Christian believes that our Lord's revelation was final and complete, though its implications are not yet fully explored. His view then of disease as a degradation and disarrangement of the personal entity having moral and spiritual roots in a kingdom of evil (pp. 112 ff.) will claim the special attention of the reader. That Christ "wherever possible worked by natural means" will not obscure the fact that what He really brought into operation was not the higher laws of nature but the laws of a Higher Nature (p. 125).

The author devotes some space to the consideration of healing within the Church, specifically, as distinguished from ecclesiastical influence or the healing art generally. In some respects this is the most disappointing part of the book. He hardly does justice to the positive and effective work of the Church, nor does he give sufficient weight to the continuity of her commission to heal as part of her normal equipment. The command to heal as part of the preaching of the Gospel was not given to men skilled in medical or psychological knowledge. It was not based on that, though necessarily time would bring it into contact with such knowledge. Its power does not depend upon those relations, though they afford most valuable means of approach.

So it is disappointing that a good deal of Mr. Dawson's survey of the Church's work should be concerned with the superstitious theories or practices which have encumbered it. Some attention is given to present-day efforts to promote religious healing, and no doubt some of the strictures passed upon them are salutary. Rather surprisingly, no mention is made of one particular effort within the Church itself. For many years a society (the Guild of St. Raphael) of Bishops and clergy, doctors and lay communicants have been doing quiet but important work for the restoration of religious healing within the Church, and to relate it to other methods of healing.

A real synthesis between scientific and religious healing, which the author so much desires, will only come about when it is fully recognized that within her sacramental system (which is indeed the necessary expression of her life as the Body of Christ) the Church's contribution is as real and valid as the contribution of the other elements in the synthesis. Mr. Dawson's important study carries us a long way towards such recognition, but not quite all the way.

J. R. PRIDIE.

THE OLD TESTAMENT: A REINTERPRETATION. By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

"Modern knowledge and modern needs call for a reinterpretation of the Bible." How true these opening words of Dr. Cook's Preface are will be especially recognized by those who have to teach the Bible to those of both sexes whose minds have been influenced by the modern spirit, and who are, therefore, beginning, on the one hand, to realize the many difficulties presented in the Bible, and who, on the other hand, ardently desire to know if and how these difficulties are to be solved. We can confidently affirm that Professor Cook's fascinating book will be of immense value both to teachers and students. There are not many Old Testament scholars, either in England or other countries, who have such a wide knowledge of the Old Testament and the subjects now universally recognized as being indispensable to the full understanding of it—ancient history, comparative religion, folklore, archæology, and the obvious and antecedent necessity of a knowledge of Semitic languages. And, we must add, there are probably still fewer Old Testament scholars who combine with their knowledge the manifest and sane piety, together with a sympathetic spirit of kindly toleration for those whose views may differ in some points from his, that is characteristic of the writer throughout this book. Not that Professor Cook's book is controversial or polemical in any sense; it states facts, conveys information, reveals truths; if that involves controversy, it is not Professor Cook's concern, at any rate not in this book. To be sure, one cannot fail to see that the entire contents of the book undermines what is termed Fundamentalism; Professor Cook knows that well enough; but his attitude towards the Fundamentalist position is a model of sympathetic toleration and kindness. From beginning to end he is constructive, persuasive, almost appealing. As we read the book we feel that if evidence, fact, truth, common sense, were allowed fair-play, Fundamentalists would confess that this book had taken their position by storm; it would, moreover, prove to them that their whole point of view arose from the fact that they are so inadequately acquainted with the Bible!

However, the book, as we have said, is not written with the purpose of combating any school of thought; it is, in the strict sense of the word, a reinterpretation, demanded by the new knowledge from various sources that has poured in during the last generation or two. The ground covered is very wide. Professor Cook starts, appropriately enough, with an informing chapter on the history of the English Bible, and shews, among

other things, that the "critical" study of the Bible has been age-long; but, as he points out, by the term criticism "we mean the enquiry into the contents, qualities, and character of our evidence, and into the various questions that arise out of it—questions of origin, date, authenticity and so forth"; and then goes on to point out that one cannot, in practice, separate what are called the "higher" and "lower" criticism of the Bible. That is very true, but unfortunately that truth is often not realized by those who inveigh against the "Higher Critics." Chapters are then devoted to questions concerning the Hebrew Text, the Canon, and their history. We must congratulate Professor Cook on the lucid way in which he handles these matters; their intricacy might easily daunt those who know but little about them, but with Professor Cook as a guide they need have no fear; he not only knows, but has the art of conveying knowledge clearly and interestingly to others.

Sometimes, it is true, questions arise which, however lucidly treated, are bound to be a little difficult to non-experts; we may give one illustration: "When we examine the historical writings of the Old Testament more closely we find three far-reaching interests which have gone to shape them"; these concern, first, the priesthood. Professor Cook shews from quotations that among the priests there were periods of hostility and change, rivalry and compromise; this is reflected in the pages of the Old Testament, there is no getting away from that; but, as Professor Cook says, "The priestly factor in the growth of the Old Testament narrative is one of the most difficult of problems in the higher reaches of criticism." The second far-reaching interest, which has left many marks in the Old Testament, is the relation between Judah and Israel. This is not so difficult to trace out, but unless it is taken into consideration there will be found to be much in the Old Testament which cannot be properly understood. This applies with special force to the post-exilic period. And the third of these interests, owing to which Old Testament history has suffered some "manipulation," is the account of the Exodus, or we should rather say, the accounts of this, for there is more than one account. These are all intricate matters, but most important for the study of the Old Testament, and we are grateful to Professor Cook for having not only drawn attention to them in this book, but also for having dealt with them in such a clear and informing manner.

Other chapters deal with the land of Palestine, its physical features, etc., and the effect which these have had upon the history and religion of the people. Of great importance are the chapters which treat of the religion of the Old Testament, belief in God and in immortality, and the struggle for ethical mono-

theism. Of all these much could be said, did space permit; they are illuminating in their insight, and in the way in which these profound subjects are handled.

One final word must, however, be added in reference to the chapter on the Prophets. In a book which is throughout of such excellence, it is perhaps hardly called for that one section should be singled out as rising in excellence above the rest; but there is so much in this chapter on the Prophets which is of vital and permanent value, that we cannot refrain from drawing particular attention to it. One quotation will give a good insight into Professor Cook's mind: "The prophets laid the foundation of a religious philosophy that would bring the supersensuous and the world of Space and Time within the same focus." Let that thought, that fact, be pondered over in the light of what Professor Cook writes, and readers will acknowledge the debt of gratitude to him who led them into paths of beauty and truth.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

ABRAHAM. By Sir Leonard Woolley. Faber and Faber.
7s. 6d.

This is a striking contribution to the elucidation and dating of the Patriarchal narratives of the Old Testament. The author sets out to establish the historical accuracy of the Babylonian narrative, both in facts and in local colouring, as authenticated by his own discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees. There is not the slightest doubt that Tell Mugheir (Mound of Pitch), which he excavated, is the site of Ur which was then held by the Sumerians.

His description of the town as Abraham must have known it, its Temple, its Ziggurat (the prototype of the Tower of Babel), its dwellings, the social conditions of the time, the collecting and handling of the revenue in kind paid into the Temple, the weaving of cloth, the working in gold and silver, and his reconstruction of a two-storeyed house of the time of Abraham make striking reading. As we find today in Eastern towns, the street level was continually rising by the accumulation of rubbish, and the floor levels were correspondingly sinking, just as we found also in ancient Zion in the ruins of old Hebrew houses where the floor level had been repeatedly heightened by packed clay; but the official soothsayers seem to have encouraged the people to live under street level, for a contemporary tablet credits them with the proverb, "A house to be lucky should be below street level." The author regards Abraham as originally a city-dweller, and traces the influence of town-life on his mind and actions in the Old Testament narrative, even after he became a

nomad. "There is no doubt (he says) that in their nomad tents the life of the Patriarchs was guided and controlled by Sumerian (Babylonian) laws and customs." Sumerian law allowed only one wife, but with her consent a man might have several concubines who were not on an equality with her, as we find in the case of Abraham and Jacob. In the story of Ishmael, Abraham closely conforms to Sumerian custom and social law, though in details he disregards them.

The sacrifice of Isaac is a concession to Canaanite practice—the Sumerians did not sacrifice their first-born to their gods—but the incident as described is a justification of Sumerian practice. Rachel's purpose in stealing the teraphim has never been understood. The possession of these images conferred the right of heirship. Rachel was therefore conferring on Jacob another birthright in addition to that he had stolen from Esau! Woolley affirms that Abraham was converted from polytheism to monotheism before he left Ur. Here are some of the outstanding facts established by the author. The Amorites, who were in Palestine at 4000, are found as stock-breeders at Drehem, south-east of Babylon, at 2300 B.C. At 1950-1900 the Habiru (Habiri of Tell el Amarna Letters) appear in South Babylonia as mercenaries employed in the Sumerian army. These are Aramæan nomads, "undoubtedly of the same race as the Amorite stock-raisers of Drehem": and their name appears preceded by the ideogram for "cut-throats or brigands" exactly as in the Tell el Amarna Letters. Thus it follows that the Habiru of Babylonia and the Habiri are identical, both Aramæan and kindred to the Amorites; but the author regards them also as the same people as the Old Testament Hebrews. It follows that Abraham is an Amorite or Aramæan, as the writer of this review has elsewhere maintained.

An interesting confirmation of these identifications is his discovery of an altar below the floor of a temple of the III. Dynasty of Ur (2300), which is not Babylonian, but set up in exact accordance with Hebrew ritual, and which must have been built by the Amorite stock-raisers. The features are the use of burnt earth beneath it for purification, and unhewn stones in the altar itself (Exod. xx. 25). This certainly seems to establish affinity between the Hebrew and the Amorite religion.

His conclusions regarding Abraham may be summed up briefly—he is an historical personage. He lived his early life as a city-dweller in Ur, and became a nomad sheepmaster. He was an Amorite, one of the Habiru. He migrated to Canaan in one of the westward movements of the Habiru about the twentieth century B.C. There is no actual record to prove that he is historical; but the Old Testament narrative is so

accurate in its local colouring as to leave little doubt. Any doubt is completely dispelled by recent discoveries at Ur.

The author is convinced that the Old Testament record "has to be accepted as more or less contemporary, and therefore in its essence true." In other words the Bible story embodies, or is based on, an original contemporary document, and any later additions are concerned not with the actual facts, but with the religious and ethical value of the narrative.

J. GARROW DUNCAN.

NOTICES

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA. By W. O. E. Oesterley. Pp. 345. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d. net.

In the twenty-one years that have elapsed since Dr. Oesterley's previous volume of the Books of the Apocrypha appeared a considerable amount of new material has come to hand, which has necessitated a completely new book rather than a new edition of the earlier volume. In the production of such an "Introduction" there is no one better equipped for the task both as regards ripeness of scholarship and lucidity of expression, and the work is one which without reservation can be commended alike to the scholar and student of Biblical theology, the parochial clergy and the educated laity.

The first part is "prolegomena to the Apocrypha," and as such is devoted to an analysis of the literature from a literary, historical and doctrinal standpoint. In the second and remaining part a valuable critical summary of each of the books is given respecting title, date, contents, authorship, language, text, version, purpose and literature. Thus, the whole collection of writings comprised in the Apocrypha is brought under review, and much light thrown upon the Jewish literary versatility during the troublous centuries which witnessed the Maccabean revolt and Roman domination and misrule in Palestine. The tumultuous nature of the period gives a particular character and significance to the literature, while the contacts with external influences are exemplified in the conception of Wisdom, the pre-existence of the soul, and the four cardinal virtues of Stoic origin, to say nothing of the relation of the Hebrew Wisdom Books to those of Egypt, Babylonia and Persia.

The contribution of the Apocrypha to Jewish theological thought is brought out clearly under various headings. The belief in God is identical with that of the Old Testament in its most highly developed form, but in the attitude to the Law the Pharisaic standpoint is maintained for the most part in this literature. The instances of a divergent view are exceptional, and these are enumerated. Emphasis is laid on the veneration for the Scriptures and their authoritative character. The sacrificial system is taken for granted, but it is unequally treated by the authors in the different books. Thus, in 1 Esdras it is frequently mentioned, but in Tobit it is scarcely noticed. An ethical significance is given to the ritual by Ben-Sira, so that "the sacrifice of an unrighteous man" is said to be "a mock-

ing sacrifice, and the oblations of the wicked are not acceptable." In the discussion of the doctrine of original sin it is pointed out that the transmission of evil to the whole human race as a result of Adam's transgression does not occur till the later book of 2 Esdras, where the Messianic Age is also fully treated, but elsewhere Messianism is relegated to the background. Regarding the conceptions of the Hereafter, there is a great variety of beliefs in which the traditional notion of Sheol, the doctrine of an intermediate state and a Day of Judgment followed by a Resurrection variously interpreted have a place. After a brief reference to angelology and demonology, which might well be expanded, a chapter is devoted to the points of contact between the doctrinal teaching of the Apocrypha and Christian belief as set forth in the New Testament.

In the more detailed treatment of the individual books in Part II. Dr. Oesterley discusses questions of authorship and arrangement of the historical material with learning and acumen. On the main point concerning the diversity of authorship of chapters iii.-xiv. of 1 Esdras he agrees with Kabisch and Box, but he rejects Kaminka's arguments for an early date of this apocalypse. Tobit he regards as a unity originally written in all probability in Hebrew, but he thinks it is by no means certain that unity of authorship can be claimed for the Wisdom of Solomon. It was not the work of Philo, though the original was written in Greek at Alexandria about A.D. 40. On the other hand, he assumes either an Aramaic or Hebrew original for the story of Bel and the Dragon and Baruch.

E. O. JAMES.

THE YEAR WITH CHRIST. Seventy-four short sermons for Sundays and principal holy-days. By M. J. Hardy, M.G. Mowbrays. 6s.

Would Scott Holland's wonderful orations appeal to this generation? It is doubtful. In these days brevity and directness are rated above eloquence and felicity of illustration. Mr. Hardy meets this demand. It is more important that a sermon should be straight to the point than "straight from the shoulder," and modern congregations, especially at a sung Eucharist, have no time for "firstly, secondly and thirdly." Mr. Hardy dispenses with these formal divisions, and though the familiar "placere, docere, movere" is there, it is not obtruded. These are not sermon "skeletons," but complete discourses which may profitably be used as meditations. There is a delightful Christmas sermon, and a particularly useful and much-needed discourse on "The Society Mind" set for Trinity II. It is doubtful whether "Monday in Easter Week" is a holy-day which demands a sermon, but a sermon is provided which is suitable for any time in the Easter festival.

Evidence of Mr. Hardy's wide reading abounds on every page, and though he refers freely to moderns like Christopher Dawson, he does not neglect William Law and the classics. This collection of sermons shews exactly how to appeal to the modern listener and to convey in short compass an immense amount of solid instruction.

CREATIVE SOCIETY. By John MacMurray. S.C.M. 5s.

Mr. MacMurray tells us in his opening pages that he has for years made several attempts to write a book on the relation between Christianity and Communism. He has succeeded in digging down to the very roots

of the two systems or religions. The dry bracing air of his native Scotland blows through the book. It is stark but stimulating. His conclusion is that real and essential Christianity is the only satisfactory completion and fruition of Communism.

Every chapter in the book has been well weighed and almost every word. But perhaps the most valuable chapters are three. In what he calls "Pseudo-religion," he conducts an interesting psychological analysis of the instincts of fear and love, and shews how the universal human fear of death may be twisted by a false religion into a means of satisfying man's craving for immortality while deadening him to the problems of this present life. Fear produces in us the motive of a hunger for power, and drives men into isolation. "Life which is dominated by fear is everywhere and always on the defensive. Whatever is other than itself is a potential source of danger to be guarded against. The need of such a life is for power to defend itself against the world." It was to save man from isolation that our Lord founded the Catholic Church.

Elsewhere he gives us a masterly account of our Lord's ministry seen through the eyes of a social historian, and paints Him as a social revolutionary, whose three years' work is unique in its weaving together of theory and practice, of teaching and action. It is in the fusion of insight and action that he finds the supremacy of Jesus.

In his last chapter, headed "Now is the judgment of this world," he throws light on the contemporary situation from the standpoint of his definition of Christianity. He sees human society developing towards the creation of an universal human community. Fear has brought isolation in its train, an isolation deepened through a false insistence on Marxist doctrines. Christianity, freed from its "idealism" and consequent refusal to face reality, is the only solution. "It is in England, if anywhere, that real Christianity provides the answer to the situation" are the concluding words of the book.

G. KEABLE.

THEOLOGIE DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS. By F. Büchsel. Verlag C. Bertelsmann. Gütersloh. M. 7.50.

Systematic treatment of New Testament theology has been rather in the background during recent years, and a new book, especially when it is as good as this, deserves a warm welcome. I know nothing in English which approaches it for conciseness, scholarship, comprehensiveness, and religious tone. Now, more than ever, "read German books" is a sound maxim. Whether it be the Catholic school typified by K. Adam or the conservative Lutheranism which has come to the front again, they give us much which is difficult to find in English books. And, more important still, they make us love Germans, whatever our attitude towards "Germany."

Some of Dr. Büchsel's positions which seem to me especially deserving of attention may be quoted. "Man exists as a member of a people, a citizen of a state. The attitude of Jesus towards people and state corresponds to His attitude towards the family: He affirms them but limits their value" (p. 27). Our Lord's attack on riches takes up the attack of the Old Testament prophets on idols: Mammon is a *false god*. The poor man's besetting temptation is anxiety, which is his chief obstacle to serving God (p. 28). "The famous 'love without hope of reward' of

the mystics—the subtlest form of godlessness” (p. 32). “The thought that we are children of God is for Jesus anything but a goodnight kiss for feeble religiosity” (p. 33). “The high demands of the Sermon on the Mount are only possible because they are preceded by the gracious promises of the Beatitudes and the Sayings about Light and Salt.”

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

ANARCHY OR WORLD ORDER. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

It is inevitable that lectures delivered in August, 1935, under the auspices of the Geneva Institute of International Relations should be in some ways out of date by the time they are published. But the principles enunciated by the distinguished essayists (including A. E. Zimmern, P. J. Noel-Baker, R. B. Mowat, etc.) remain unshaken. Those who think lightly of the League of Nations should study this book and learn with what skill and patience the foundations of a world-order are being laid. Perhaps we should say the seeds are being sown—in soil often stony and beset with thorns. One lesson seems to be taught plainly. The world is being rapidly made into one whole. That is obvious. What is not so obvious is that what the social conflict and the class war are within a nation the international ferment is in the world as a whole. The internal social organization of the nations is comparatively unimportant; whatever their government, the fact remains that some are rich, others poor. Some are favoured by nature and past history, others are right behind in the race.

We must not suppose that our generation is particularly wicked. Only it has been given the supremely difficult task of organizing a world-order, of grappling on an ecumenical scale with the very problems which at home are almost insoluble in the individual state.

The only way out internationally is the way which England seems to be practising at home with some success: a levelling up of the less fortunate classes to a minimum of health, education, nourishment, security—accomplished to a certain extent at the expense of the more fortunate classes but partly by the increase of real wealth through the advance in technique. In the long run world-peace can only be achieved by a levelling up of the backward countries.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

CHRISTIANITY, HISTORY, AND CIVILIZATION. By Roger B. Lloyd. Lovat Dickson. 10s. 6d.

The Rev. R. B. Lloyd has written a deeply impressive book on the relationships existing between three of the deepest matters in our mental composition, and to the consideration of these matters he brings wide reading and a mature judgment. It is plain that throughout his book he has fallen under the spell of Professor Toynbee's three volumes on a study of history. Well, there can be little doubt that our author has a master in Israel for his guide, and he himself is worthy of his guide. He has much to say on the connection of Christianity with civilization, and it is obvious that a primitive Christian was one who was also contributing to the cause of civilization. Of course, such a position could not neces-

sarily be maintained nowadays, for men like Mr. Aldous Huxley and Mr. Bertrand Russell refuse to call themselves Christians, and who can doubt that they are highly civilized? Mr. Lloyd then sweeps through the centuries from B.C. to the present moment. Periclean Athens, Renaissance Florence, Oxford and Cambridge at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and Voltairian Paris—these are the periods on which he mainly fastens, and he subjects them to a fine analysis. We so much like the book that we hesitate to criticize it, and yet occasionally it seems to us as if he unduly limits the causes, courses, and consequences he considers. His four periods are among the great periods in the history of the world, though we venture to put in a word for the thirteenth century, the greatest of all centuries A.D. No doubt he would reply that in the short compass of 279 pages he cannot cover the whole course of history. He believes that the four periods he has carefully selected are those in which civilization reached a really high level, and they all collapsed with swiftness and with completeness. The main reason, in his judgment, is that the leaders of these four civilizations treated their fellow-citizens, for the most part, as means and not as ends. There is much to be said for this point of view, but with Voltairian Paris we entirely doubt if it is sufficient to cover the collapse of its civilization. The French Church allowed the grossest immoralities to be practised in high places, and to be practised unrebuked. Bishops and even archbishops openly kept mistresses, and public opinion barely condemned this state of affairs. Voltaire did so condemn it, and he worked with all his might to succour the ill-treated and the wrongly judged, and he spent himself time and again on behalf of all such folk. Obviously, he was not lacking in consideration of his countrymen as means as well as ends. He possessed a very high ethical quality, and from this angle was much more religious at bottom than prelate after prelate of the French Church.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

CHURCHES, SECTS AND RELIGIOUS PARTIES. By G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. S.P.C.K. 3s.

This book, most of which has previously appeared in the *Southwark Diocesan Gazette*, is a useful guide to the religious movements of the present time and provides much information about the general history of the Church. It is divided into three parts, "The Historic Churches," "The Free Churches," and "Various Sects and Doctrines." The last include "British-Israelism," "Christian Science," "Theosophy," and five other similar movements. It is curious, however, that there is no chapter on the Group Movement.

Dr. Butterworth writes from a definitely Anglican standpoint, but his sympathies are catholic, and he sees the best as well as the worst in the various churches and doctrines which he describes. His descriptions are concise and accurate, and at the same time interesting. The book will be found pleasant to read, quite apart from its utility as a work of reference. It would have been a considerable advantage if at the end of each chapter one or two books could have been recommended where further information can be found.

A. R. VIDLER.

THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN ITS EVOLUTION. An Introduction to its Scientific Study. By Anatol F. Semenov. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This book aims at giving a brief sketch of the development of the Greek language from ancient times to the present day. The first part surveys this development, including an account of the various dialects of modern as well as of ancient Greek; the second part is chiefly concerned with the syntax of the classical writers. The author, who writes for students rather than for professional philologists, has succeeded in giving a good deal of information in a small compass; but as a Russian he writes at a disadvantage. His English is often clumsy and his meaning not always clearly conveyed; moreover, he lacks the knowledge that an English writer would have of how much his readers will know already and where explanation is needed. There are signs, too, of a lack of care in the preparation of the book for the press which will further detract from its usefulness.

M. L. CLARKE.

SOME STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By H. F. B. Mackay. Centenary Press. 6s.

The publication of a new book by the late Father Mackay was always a pleasurable event, and the volume before us shews that, in spite of advancing years, his hand had in no way lost its cunning.

It may be merely personal idiosyncrasy which leads one to think that his best works are two which are not directly scriptural—i.e., *Saints and Leaders* and *Pilgrim's Progress in the World To-day*. Nevertheless, Father Mackay brings to the explanation of Holy Writ a freshness born of real learning and an original mind, combined with a wisdom which is the fruit of a deep understanding of the human heart, a somewhat unusual combination which makes whatever he writes at once arresting and valuable.

The purpose of these studies is not primarily exegetical but devotional and spiritual, and if Father Mackay sometimes reads into his text rather more than on strictly critical principles it contains this is not a serious defect, since his deductions are spiritually sound. The eight studies on the Beatitudes are a study in the Christian character which is worthy of careful thought; besides them we have eighteen detached studies: twelve on the Gospels, three from St. Paul and one each from Acts, Hebrews and the Apocalypse, each bringing home a lesson well worth the learning.

F. P. HARTON.

A CAMBRIDGE BEDE BOOK. By Eric Milner-White, D.S.O., M.A. Longmans. 5s.

This is a book of collects; but they are not intended to be used, as collects usually are, as purely vocal prayers. Starting from the fact that a properly constructed collect is a meditation *in petto*, Mr. Milner-White has made these for such use, and prayed affectively, a clause at a time, they should be of great value to many who need this sort of help.

It is said with some truth that collect-making is a wellnigh lost art; certainly the making of seventy collects is a formidable undertaking, and we should expect the seventy to vary in excellence, as indeed they do, but taken as a whole they maintain a high level. A few are too purely petitionary to fulfil the whole purpose their author has in view, and

occasionally a turn of phrase is too reminiscent of the seventeenth century to be used without self-consciousness in the twentieth, but such blemishes are few.

It is a great disadvantage in a book intended for constant use that the arrangement is somewhat haphazard, and there is no indication, by index or otherwise, of subject-matter, the headings on the left-hand pages being mostly useless for this purpose.

There is a real devotional use in printing one collect only at an opening, but it has the disadvantage of making the price of the book much too high.

F. P. HARTON.

THE TRUE PRAYERS OF ST. GERTRUDE AND ST. MECHTILDE. Translated by Canon John Gay. Sheed and Ward. 3s. 6d.

For something over a century a work purporting to contain the prayers of SS. Gertrude and Mechtilde has enjoyed a good deal of popularity amongst the devout, but it was not the work of the saints in question, it was a seventeenth-century forgery. Eight years ago Canon Gay edited an authentic version of the prayers of these saints from the original records under the title of *O Beata Trinitas*, of which the present work is a third edition. The editing and arranging of these prayers can have been no light task, but Canon Gay has done his work well; the translation is sound and idiomatic and the arrangement excellent.

A perusal of this work will convince anyone who may be inclined to dismiss SS. Gertrude and Mechtilde as hysterical visionaries that such an estimate is very wide of the mark, and that they were as a matter of fact, like most real contemplatives, extremely sane and wise. This is one of the few books which will give those who pray affectively just what they need to help them to more perfect union with God.

F. P. HARTON.

WESTMINSTER PRAYERS. By P. Dearmer and F. R. Barry. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

This collection of prayers consists of two sections—one containing some 128 short prayers and collects for use on various occasions, and the other "Litanies and Special Services." We are told in the preface that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster "have for some time felt the need of a collection for occasional use" and that these had been put together "in the hope that they may meet the need." "They have not been adopted by the Chapter."

The book contains many prayers of real beauty: and it is therefore all the more to be regretted that the collection is marred by many blemishes. The prevailing atmosphere is that of the Grey Book, with much of the jargon that we have come to associate with that publication.

For instance, the following is suggested as a vestry prayer: "O Lord, accept this offering of thy people's worship: pardon our wandering thoughts: and keep us in the eternal values of thy grace, that we may be near to thee for ever." What can that last sentence possibly mean? It is hard enough in any case to prevent choirboys from giggling! Or again: "Shine upon our minds, O Lord, as the sun shines upon the trees, and as they spread out their branches to the light, so may we spread out our hearts to thy love, and grow in strength and goodness."

And while the well-known translation of a Gelasian collect is properly included, another prayer, evidently based on it, is also given. If the two prayers are placed in parallel columns the contrast will be evident—and painful.

No. 10 (for Knowledge).

Eternal God, the light of the minds that know thee, the joy of the hearts that love thee, and the strength of the wills that serve thee; grant us so to know thee that we may truly love thee, and so to love that we may fully serve thee, to the honour and glory of thy Name.

No. 26 (for Vision).

O God, Light of the minds that know thee, Life of the souls that love thee and Strength of the thoughts that seek thee, enlarge our minds and raise the vision of our hearts that with swift wings of thought our spirits may reach thee, the Eternal Wisdom who art from everlasting.

We presume that the prayers are meant for use in church. The reviewer would not like to read the following in public: "impatient of wrongdoing yet patient under obstruction, we may boldly follow where the Spirit shall lead us, with life more abundant and liberty to do thy work."

In the excellent chapter on "The Art of Making Collects," in his book *The Art of Public Worship*, Dr. Dearmer speaks very sternly about those who cut about and spoil collects and prayers. The act he says is "illegal, inartistic and improper." It is unfortunate that he has not adhered to his principles.

The second section is bewildering. All of us have had on various occasions to improvise services and unfortunately sometimes to be present at similar services (improvised by others!). A general direction for such occasions would be valuable: but what we are given here is something rare and strange. A civic service begins by the Rector saying, "You are right welcome, Mr. Mayor, in the name of *God*, to our parish church. We rejoice that you are come hither, and would gladly know how we may serve you" (No. 15).

On the whole, we are not surprised that the Chapter of Westminster has not adopted the book.

H. E. WYNN.

THE MASS OF THE PRE-SANCTIFIED. By Gregory Dix, O.S.B. The Church Literature Association. 6d.

An admirable little piece of work from the pages of *Laudate* and well worth reprinting. We may not agree that "nothing in the whole liturgical cycle is more moving" than the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified, indeed the writer himself says that the rite has a certain "inconsequence which distracts devotion." We may criticize little points such as his quotation of Pio Nono's *La Tradizione son' Io* in a sense so far from the original. We may regret that his last sentence reads too like a gibe at the use of the Ten Commandments, which Pusey and Dr. Gore valued so highly. But that does not much matter. The whole is a specimen of how such work should be done. It is a scholarly study of the past clearly put, with references, for the ordinary reader.

He takes the three parts of the Roman Good Friday service, the Synaxis or "Morning Prayer," the Veneration of the Cross, and the Communion of the Pre-Sanctified. He shews how the first, though traceable in form to primitive Jewish tradition, is comparatively late as a part of Good Friday worship; how the second is due to a popular devotion of fourth-century Jerusalem; how the custom of Communion with the pre-sanctified and reserved Sacrament goes back to the time of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (c. 220), when the faithful administered Communion to themselves at home on days when there was no celebration of the mysteries. In this latter connexion he suggests that Tertullian's statement that the layman also "offer and dip" (*De Ex. Cast. et offers et tinguis*) refers not, as it has often been taken, to celebrating and baptizing but to offering prayer, perhaps the Lord's Prayer, and "consecrating" a chalice by intinction when communicating himself at home. His final conclusion is that "the result was a compromise: Communion publicly distributed as it had been privately of old on days when there was no celebration of the Liturgy," and that "the Communion of the Pre-Sanctified is the only real 'primitive' thing in the worship of Good Friday."

But is there any evidence in the *Apostolic Tradition* that it was privately distributed? Was it not publicly distributed on Sunday and privately administered on other days at home? If so, it would seem that the present-day custom bears just the same relation to primitive practice as does the synaxis to the private and domestic prayers out of which it in large part developed, and as the popular public devotion of the Veneration of the Cross to, say, the private and personal commemoration of the Passion at the third, sixth and ninth hours.

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

THE STUDENT'S INTRODUCTION TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By E. Basil REDLICH, B.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

This introduction to the Synoptic Gospels should be found useful for senior forms in schools and by others who are beginning the study of theology. It is intended for readers who do not know any Greek. Canon Redlich deals chiefly with the synoptic problem and with source-criticism; the absence of any reference to form-criticism limits the value of the book. While it is designed for those who have no previous knowledge of the subject, there is no attempt to avoid entering into technical details. Nor does Canon Redlich hesitate to reach definite conclusions on disputable topics. "Q was a guide to Christian life and conduct, specially written to meet the needs of the Antiochene Church at a time of crisis." He argues that St. Luke was possibly or probably the author of Q. He is also a supporter of the Proto-Luke theory and states the evidence in its favour forcibly, but he does not give equal attention to the arguments on the other side, which have been put forward by Professor Creed and others. Again, he overstates the case for the acquaintance of the Fourth Evangelist with Mark and Luke or L. But he may be right in thinking that those for whom he specially writes will be more favourably impressed by definite conclusions than by a studiously non-committal attitude. At the end of the book there is printed a hypothetical reconstruction of Q, M and L.

A. R. VIDLER.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXII

JANUARY—JUNE, 1936

	PAGE
Advent	45
Age for Confirmation, The.	109, 172
ALEXANDER NAIRNE	298
Ancient Roman Rite, The	174, 234
Approach to the Atonement, The	353
Ascension and the Apocalyptic Hope, The	356
BADCOCK, F. J.	197
BALMFORTH, H.	304
BELL, BERNARD IDDINGS	70
BICKERSTETH, CONSTANCE	330
Bolshevist View of Life, The	203
Books Reviewed:	
Abraham. By Sir L. Woolley	366
Adversus Judæos. By Lukyn Williams, D.D.	177
Christian Social Tradition, The. By R. Tribe, S.S.M.	116
II. Corinthians. By R. H. Strachan	115
Dispensations. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson	119
Gospel and the Catholic Church, The. By A. M. Ramsey	307
Healing, Pagan and Christian. By G. G. Dawson	362
Old Testament: a Reinterpretation. By S. A. Cook	364
Orthodox Church, The. By Sergius Bulgakov	46
Reconstruction of Early Christian Documents—I. By H. J. Bardsley	48
Saint Peter Canisius. By James Broderick	306
Spirit of Mediæval Philosophy. By Étienne Gilson	239
Visio Sancti Pauli. By Theodore Silverstein	310
World and God, The. By H. H. Farmer	304
Brechin, Bishop of	306
BULL, PAUL B.	116
BURCH, V.	177
Buried Alive	216
Cardinal Newman on Bishop Butler	113
Christian Politics	134
Christianity as a Historical Religion	8
Church and Divorce, The	320
Church and War, The	288
Church, The	197
CLARKE, EDWARD T.	109
Conversion of the Clergy, The	278
COOPER, IRENE SHEWELL	294
Correspondence	45, 172, 235
Country Parson and his Failures, The.	172
Country Parishes	343
COWLEY, PATRICK	81
Cranmer on the Lord's Supper	330
Critical Note on the Logic of Birth Control, A	301
Cure of Souls, The	81
Development of the Roman Rite during the Dark Ages, The	142
Diocese of Gibraltar and Reunion, The	17
DIX, GREGORY	48
DOWNTON, F. M.	107, 235
DUNLOP, D. C.	234
EGERTON SWANN, N. E.	44
EISLER, DR.	176
Eschatological Teaching in the Gospels	339
FERRAR, W. J.	37
For the Novena of God the Holy Ghost	302
Four Kings	43
Gibraltar, Archdeacon of	17
HARRIS, G. H.	45
HEALEY, K.	301
HEAZELL, F. N.	46
HEBERT, A. G.	173, 407
HITCHCOCK, F. R. MONTGOMERY	98

	PAGE
HOLMES GORE, V. A.	111, 175, 356
HOPKINSON, PHILIP	298
HUMPHRIES, JOHN A.	235
HUSAIN, I.	299
JENKINS, CLAUDE	310
Jewish Kingship and the Sacred Combat, The	37
Job of School Chaplain, The	166
JOHN DONNE: On Conversion	299
Jones of Nayland	355
KIDD, B. J.	119
KNOX, W. L.	115
LANG, L. W.	278
LEACH, N. K.	343
LEVETOFF, OLGA	339
Logic of Birth Control, The	220
LYTTELTON, E.	172
MACGREGOR, D. B.	358
MASCALL, E. L.	239
MASON, AGNES.	91
MORRICE, R. J.	366
MORTIMER, R.	320
MOSSNER, E. C.	113
MURRAY, J. O. F.	269
New Dogmas	155
Note on St. Matthew xv. 21-28	366
Note on St. Matthew xix. 3-12	107, 175, 235
Notes on Periodicals	114, 237
OESTERLEY, W. O. E.	364
OLDAKER, W. K.	166
Original Sin	28
PARKER, J. W.	216
Parson's Job, A	235
PIER, OTTO	134
PITTINGER, W. NORMAN	284
Practice of Spiritual Communion, Notes on	91
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T.	353
PRIDIE, J. R.	362
Print of the Nails	366
Problem of the Lectionary	358
Prolegomena of Theological Unity	44
Religion and Institutions	161
Religious Genius of Henry Vaughan, The	294
St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh	111
SAMPSON, ASHLEY	220
S. C. C.	43, 176
Seraphic Doctor, The	284
SIMPSON, ALAN H.	203
SINCLAIR, J. S.	142
SHORT, A. E.	288
Skit on Greek Philosophy, A	98
Sociology, Catholic and Secularist	70
SPARROW SIMPSON, W. J.	155, 229
Spirit in the Old Testament Writings, The	256
STACY, PAUL	302
STEVENSON, G. H.	161
TAYLOR, R. O. P.	28
TOWNER, L. B.	366
TRIBE, R. H.	256
Waiting Time at Nazareth, The	269
What is a Dispensation?	229
William Law on England and Rome	351
W. K. L. C.	355
York, The Archbishop of	8

